DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 370 UD 028 867

AUTHOR Diaz, Carlos, Ed.
TITLE Multicultural Education for the 21st Century. NEA School Restructuring Series.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-8106-3012-5
PUB DATE Jul 92
NOTE 223p.
AVAILABLE FROM NEA Professional Library, P.O. Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516 (Stock No. 1849-4-00).
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Affirmative Action; Civil Liberties; Classroom Techniques; Cognitive Style; *Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Development; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Futures (of Society); *Multicultural Education; *School Restructuring; School Role; Special Education; Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Language Diversity

ABSTRACT

This book presents a selection of readings that address multiculturalism and school restructuring as a reference for schools working to enrich their school-improvement agendas. The readings treat many areas within curriculum and student achievement. The 13 chapters are as follows: (1) "The Next Millennium: A Multicultural Imperative for Education" (C. F. Diaz); (2) "Multicultural Education: Nature, Challenges, and Opportunities" (J. A. Banks); (3) "Effective Teaching Practices for Multicultural Classrooms" (G. Gay); (4) "Institutional Climate: Developing an Effective Multicultural School Community" (V. O. Pang); (5) "Learning Styles: Implications for Teachers" (K. Swisher); (6) "Rethinking the Role of Gender and Achievement in Schooling" (J. Bernard-Powers); (7) "Evaluation Practices for the Multicultural Classroom" (R. J. Samuda and J. Lewis); (8) "We Speak in Many Tongues: Language Diversity and Multicultural Education" (S. Nieto); (9) "Reducing Prejudice in Society: The Role of Schools" (G. S. Pate); (10) "Involving Special Educators in Challenging Injustice in Education" (C. E. Sleeter and C. Hartney); (11) "Educating for Human Rights: A Curricular Blueprint" (R. L. Garcia); (12) "Institutionalizing Multicultural Education in Teacher Education Programs" (N. F. Daly and D. J. O'Dowd); and (13) "Resistance to Multicultural Education: Concerns and Responses" (C. F. Diaz). An Afterword entitled "The Leadership Challenge in Multicultural Education" (C. A. M. Banks) concludes the volume. An annotated bibliography of 18 items and information on the 16 contributors are also provided. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349370

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
PUBLICATION

Multicultural Education for the 21st Century

EDITOR

Carlos Díaz

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. FELTON
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert McClure
NEA Mastery In Learning Consortium
NEA National Center for Innovation
Series Editor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEA SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING SERIES

UD028867
2

UD

NEA
SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING SERIES

Multicultural Education for the 21st Century

E D I T O R

Carlos Díaz

Robert McClure
NEA Mastery In Learning Consortium
NEA National Center for Innovation
Series Editor

nea PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1992
National Education Association of the United States

Printing History
First Printing: July 1992

Note
The opinions expressed in this publication should not be construed as representing the policy or position of the National Education Association. Materials published by the NEA Professional Library are intended to be discussion documents for educators who are concerned with specialized interests of the profession.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Multicultural education for the 21st century / editor, Carlos Díaz.
p. cm. — (NEA school restructuring series)
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 0-8106-3012-5
1. Intercultural education—United States. I. Díaz, Carlos (Carlos F.) II. Title: Multicultural education for the twenty-first century. III. Series.
LC1009.3.M83 1992
370.19'341—dc20 92-10059
CIP

AUTHORS' ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Valerie Ooka Pang, author of Chapter 4, Institutional Change: Developing an Effective Multicultural School Community, wishes to acknowledge the extensive editorial assistance of Margie Kitano. In addition, Cynthia Park and Ron Evans acted as important sounding boards in the development of her chapter.

The title of Sonia Nieto's chapter, We Speak in Many Tongues: Language Diversity and Multicultural Education, is modeled after a response given by Luis Reyes to a *Time* magazine article entitled "A Confusion of Tongues." As reported in *Speaking Out About Bilingual Education: A Report on the Testimony Presented at the Community Speak-Out on Bilingual Education*, Reyes' response was: "We speak in many tongues, yet we are not confused." (Published by the Puerto Rican/Latino Education Roundtable, Hunter College, New York, NY, June 15, 1983). Sonia Nieto would like to thank Jerri Willet for reading an earlier version of her chapter and providing helpful and critical suggestions for improving it.

CONTENTS

Foreword by Robert M. McClure..... 07

Introduction by Carlos F. Díaz..... 08

Chapter 1. The Next Millennium: A Multicultural Imperative for Education
by Carlos F. Díaz..... 12

Chapter 2. Multicultural Education: Nature, Challenges, and Opportunities
by James A. Banks..... 23

Chapter 3. Effective Teaching Practices For Multicultural Classrooms
by Geneva Gay..... 38

Chapter 4. Institutional Climate: Developing an Effective Multicultural School Community
by Valerie Ooka Pang..... 57

Chapter 5. Learning Styles: Implications for Teachers
by Karen Swisher..... 72

Chapter 6. Rethinking the Role of Gender and Achievement in Schooling
by Jane Bernard-Powers..... 85

Chapter 7. Evaluation Practices For the Multicultural Classroom
by Ronald J. Samuda and John Lewis..... 97

Chapter 8. We Speak in Many Tongues: Language Diversity and Multicultural Education
by Sonia Nieto..... 112

Chapter 9. Reducing Prejudice in Society: The Role of Schools
by Glenn S. Pate..... 137

Chapter 10. Involving Special Educators in Challenging Injustice in Education
by Christine Sleeter and Constanz Hartney.. 150

Chapter 11. Educating For Human Rights: A Curriculum Blueprint
by Ricardo L. Garcia..... 166

Chapter 12. Teacher Education Programs
by Norene Daly and Deborah O'Dowd..... 179

Chapter 13. Resistance to Multicultural Education: Concerns and Responses
by Carlos E. Díaz..... 193

Afterword The Leadership Challenge in Multicultural Education
by Cherry A. McGee Banks..... 204

Annotated Bibliography by Cherry A. McGee Banks.....215

The Contributors 219

FOREWORD

True multiculturalism and true school restructuring have not often been allied. This conceptually large and practical book narrows that chasm.

It's important that this marriage occurs because too many attempts at school improvement are missing significant opportunities to serve our nation's diverse student body and our country's needs, both now and in the future. That future, by all accounts, should attend to the global, not the provincial; to the multilingual, not just to English; to the richness of our world's cultures, not just to Pax Americana.

This book will become a standard reference in schools working with the NEA National Center for Innovation because it provides the guidance they need to enrich their school-improvement agendas. I hope that other schools will also use this important contribution to the literature of school transformation.

—Robert McClure
Series Editor
Director, Mastery In Learning Consortium
NEA National Center for Innovation

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, much has been written about the demographic revolution in American society and its implications for education. Some writers have referred to this population shift as "the browning of America."

Students of color have always been part of the educational scene in this nation, but their rates of success in our schools have been significantly below those of the majority student population. Two or three decades ago, educators committed to reversing dismal success rates among students of color were often viewed as progressive, idealistic, and even unrealistic by some.

The ensuing "demographic imperative" is causing many Americans, within and outside of education, to realize that this nation simply can no longer afford rates of educational failure similar to those we have had in the past. Demographic growth patterns indicate that students of color, as well as female students, should compose a significantly higher proportion of this nation's professional, scientific, and managerial work force in the twenty-first century. However, this prospect is doubtful if the educational success rates of the late twentieth century continue into the twenty-first. Despite the immense natural wealth of the United States, our future lies in nurturing and developing our intellectual capital. Multicultural education offers a promising vehicle for reflecting cultural diversity in curriculum, classroom, and school practices.

Imagine American classrooms where field-sensitive teaching practices are as common as field-independent ones. In these classrooms, cooperative learning would teach students the value of interacting well with others as well as the rewards of individual achievement. Multiple elements of intelligence would be recognized and rewarded, and students with significant elements of social and spatial intelligence would have avenues to display

these skills, along with more traditional classroom talents such as inductive and deductive reasoning.

Teachers in these multicultural classrooms of the future would employ a wide array of teaching methods reflective of the variety of learning styles found among their students. Teachers would occasionally review their lesson plans to monitor the learning modalities being addressed as well as the content. Respect and sensitivity for gender, exceptionalities, and culture would permeate general school and classroom practices. These attitudes would serve as a magnet to increase levels of parental interest and participation in school matters.

Curriculum restructuring would precede operational changes in these multicultural classrooms. At a National Council for the Social Studies conference some years ago, Floretta Dukes McKenzie, former superintendent of schools for Washington, DC, remarked, "It is easier to move a graveyard than to change curriculum." Conceding the difficulty of any attempt to restructure the canon of knowledge, it is still imperative that this nation's curriculum be significantly reflective of national and global variations of culture.

Many Americans have realized that the isolationist tendencies in our educational practices have not and will not produce the globally literate citizens this nation needs for the twenty-first century. Therefore, the concept of global literacy has achieved a modicum of legitimacy and political currency. What is lacking, however, is the notion that we cannot create globally literate citizens who are simultaneously illiterate about the cultural variations in their own society. In other words, multicultural literacy is a precursor to global literacy. This message must reach more of our fellow citizens who have the ability to influence the educational process. American students must understand significant national and global variations of culture and achieve a level of academic mastery comparable or superior to their counterparts in other developed nations. To achieve this, educators and policy makers must be willing to "rearrange the furniture of the mind." Many school practices,

ranging from tracking to presenting a monocultural curriculum, derive their legitimacy from tradition, but they need to be re-evaluated with regard to their influence on student achievement.

Invariably, some will oppose any change in predictable practices and routines. Nevertheless, bureaucratic procedures, faculty preferences, and community priorities must be re-examined in light of their ultimate *raison d'etre:* their impact on student achievement. If found lacking, these practices should be changed so that American schools can educate the students who will carry this nation into the twenty-first century.

I am indebted to the professionals who took from their limited time to help with this publication. Particular gratitude is extended to the authors of this volume for their patience and courtesy in working with the editor through the various changes any book undergoes from the conception of an idea to the publication of the work. I also wish to thank those individuals who served as prepublication reviewers; their perceptive comments helped strengthen this volume. While these insights were most helpful, the authors and the editor assume total responsibility for the contents of this work.

—Carlos F. Díaz, Editor
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton

Chapter 1

THE NEXT MILLENNIUM: A MULTICULTURAL IMPERATIVE FOR EDUCATION

by Carlos F. Díaz

The United States has undergone a series of societal transformations during its period as a nation. The industrial revolution of the nineteenth century brought profound changes, as did the information and technological revolutions of the late twentieth century.

The twenty-first century, however, may bring this nation its most significant transition to date: a demographic revolution. What once was a country considered to be a microcosm of Europe is fast becoming a microcosm of the world.

Already one in four Americans is either an Asian, Hispanic, or African American, and students of color make up approximately one-third of the nation's public school students (Henry 1990). This demographic shift is occurring primarily for two reasons: (1) The birth rate among persons of color in our society is higher than that among whites, and (2) current and future immigrants are more likely to come from Latin American and Asian nations than European ones.

These demographic changes will have (and in fact, already are having) a significant impact on the curriculum, teaching practices, and teacher and student populations of U.S. schools. It is imperative that we examine these areas now, if we are to accommodate the multicultural needs of the school years ahead.

CURRICULUM

Despite demographic changes in the past two decades,

Anglo- and Eurocentric curricula prevail in many of this nation's schools. When multicultural content is taught, it is frequently presented in an *ethnic-additive* manner (Banks 1988). Material that focuses on ethnic groups is concentrated in special courses and offered as electives in the curriculum. Carlos Cortes and others have suggested that this practice tends to "ghettoize" ethnic content within the curriculum.

A true multicultural curriculum integrates cultural content throughout subjects and grade levels, placing new content where it is pedagogically and contextually appropriate. This *infusion* approach involves a review of the entire curriculum and affects all of the school's faculty. Perhaps these far-reaching demands are what make the infusion method less prevalent than the ethnic-additive approach. Also, because the infusion approach reaches a much higher percentage of the student population, there is a greater likelihood that parents or students will raise the question, "Why do we study this nontraditional material?"

Textbooks, too, play a critical role in the development of a basic curriculum and the ability of educators to make curricular changes. Some educators claim they don't currently teach their subjects in a multicultural manner because their textbooks impede such efforts. These educators may have a point. While textbooks have certainly improved in the past two decades, the wait for the optimal textbook could be a long one.

There is also a political dimension to the topic of textbook publication and adoption. For example, textbook publishers know they will not enhance the marketability of a new American history text by including an extensive and fair discussion of the United States' role in the Philippine Insurrection. Yet, that background would be critical to understanding the notion of Philippine sovereignty as well as in analyzing the contemporary relationship between the two countries. But it is the adoption process that is crucial for publishers, particularly in large markets such as California, Texas, and Florida.

The more heavily educators rely on a textbook as a source of information in a course, the more critical its content becomes. Most educators would agree they should not limit their teaching to information in textbooks. However, multiple demands on their time often leave them with few hours left for selecting and incorporating supplemental materials.

Nevertheless, educators across the United States need to understand that multicultural education is not a fleeting topic whose need and purpose will disappear in a year or two. Schools serve as arbiters of knowledge for every society and provide legitimacy for the information and perspectives they purvey. When they fail to inform students about specific cultural groups, they convey a picture of marginality about those groups in society.

If we were to ask this year's class of high school seniors to name some of the Hispanic Americans they've studied during grades one through 12, the results would be largely disappointing, ranging from no answer, to some Spanish-born explorers, to an occasional correct response. Judging from the results of curricular transmission, one might conclude that Hispanics are all recent arrivals or an infinitesimal portion of the population of the United States. This inaccurate perception is conveyed to Hispanic and non-Hispanic students alike, but the ramifications are doubly serious for the former group.

Restructuring the curriculum to reflect multicultural perspectives requires reconceptualizing our canon of knowledge, not simply injecting selected ethnic heroes or events into an otherwise unreconstructed curriculum. Educators who promote an infusion approach to multicultural education should be aware of such efforts at superficial or simplistic infusion.

Comprehensive restructuring will not only make the curriculum more reflective of reality for students, but will also boost student interest as pupils realize that topics can be studied from diverse, contrasting, and often fascinating perspectives.

TEACHING PRACTICES

A study of secondary school students conducted at Michigan State University in East Lansing found that one-third of all students actively resisted the curriculum, and an additional one-third resisted it passively (Sedlack et al. 1986). Clearly, a great deal more needs to be done in our classrooms to heighten the level of enthusiasm and participation among all students. For minority students, this situation is especially imperative because their rates of academic success are generally below the national average.

The types of instructional methods used in the classroom are of paramount importance. A massive observational study by John Goodlad (1984) showed that instruction based on rote questions and answers is still very prevalent in our nation's schools. Most teachers were field-independent students who performed reasonably well in an individualistic and fairly competitive classroom environment. Therefore, it is not surprising that a look at instructional methods in our nation's schools reveals a large preponderance of field-independent teaching techniques.

However, field-sensitive teaching approaches, which capitalize on human associations, correspond much more closely with the learning preferences of many students. This is especially true for minority students. All students prefer to learn in environments that are most consistent with their learning styles. Approaches like cooperative learning show great promise for involving high- and low-achieving students in common learning tasks. In fact, minority students have shown (Slavin 1983; Cohen 1986) far greater academic gains in cooperative-learning situations than in traditional classrooms.

Other approaches that involve significant interaction, such as peer tutoring or older students mentoring younger ones, also provide promising alternatives for instructing students who are deterred by formal and impersonal teaching approaches.

When it comes to examining teaching practices, we need to consider instructional time as well as instructional methods. Time-on-task studies have shown that low-achieving students receive considerably less instructional time than their high-achieving counterparts (Frederick 1977). Because larger numbers of African American and Hispanic students are found in lower-track school curricula, these students are denied the same instructional time as pupils in higher-track courses. This is a rather ironic observation, since those students who are least academically independent should receive the greatest instructional time.

Classroom atmosphere is important, too. After all, this is the setting in which teaching and learning occur. Positive classroom morale has a direct effect upon student achievement. A recent study found that when students felt relaxed and positive in a classroom, they performed better. When they were anxious, their academic performance and self-concepts declined (Walberg 1984).

It is clear that the affective domain plays a significant role in effective teaching. Not enough emphasis is placed on the pivotal role of classroom climate in the education of teachers. Research in this area needs to be an integral part of teacher education if we are to be effective in teaching the increasingly heterogeneous student population of the United States.

TEACHERS

Teacher attitudes and expectations play a significant role in classrooms as well. The bulk of research in this area indicates that racial, ethnic, and social stereotypes affect teachers' perceptions of their pupils. The Pygmalion Study (Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968) found that Mexican American students who made high achievement gains were still rated low in curiosity by their teachers.

Other research indicates that teacher ratings of like and dislike for students also paralleled social stereotypes. In other

words, teachers possessed negative opinions of both pupils of color and students of lower socioeconomic status. The body of research strongly suggests that pupils who violate teacher expectations are likely to suffer teacher rejection. This is true even if students who are expected to do poorly perform well (Brophy and Good 1974).

A study was done in Texas to test the applicability of the Banks Ethnic Identity Typology to a cross section of teachers. In that typology, the *ethnic identity clarification stage* is the minimum stage of attitudinal development teachers must meet to work effectively in schools. Fewer than one-fifth of the more than 400 teachers sampled were found to have reached the ethnic identity clarification stage. These results were true for minority- as well as majority-group teachers. Four-fifths of the sample were quite probably unprepared or unable to function in heterogeneous classrooms. Yet the entire sample was composed of in-service teachers (Ford 1979).

The consensus of the literature on teacher attitudes toward minority and lower-socioeconomic status (SES) students seems to indicate that these students, although granted access to our nation's public schools, encounter a rather different climate from their peers. This climate is often less attentive and sometimes even hostile to their educational needs. It is interesting that the data on teacher attitudes show this is consistently true on the aggregate, when few teachers would admit to it as individuals.

STUDENTS

Given the manner in which public schools in the United States function, there are a number of student characteristics that correlate with academic success.

Let's start with the fact that two-thirds of secondary students resist the curriculum, either actively or passively. (Sedlack et al. 1986) Clearly, that resistance doesn't begin in high school, but often considerably earlier. Students who show limited

progress in their early years of schooling fall farther and farther behind in succeeding years (Stanovick 1986). There are two main factors behind this phenomenon: (1) Such students continue to find the curriculum to be pedantic and unstimulating; and (2) Teaching practices tend to be unvaried and teacher-centered. The combination of these factors causes students to become increasingly passive and unmotivated with each succeeding year of school.

Educators need to understand that students' cognitive styles are different. While field-independent and field-sensitive students are found in all cultural and racial groups, research seems to indicate that Hispanic and African American students are more likely to be field-sensitive learners. Curriculum presented in a more humanistic and relational manner would be better suited for them (Ramirez and Price-Williams 1974).

The relationship between race, ethnic background, and mental ability has been the subject of much controversy and speculation. One revealing study attempted to evaluate the role of social class in determining mental ability. In this study, an examination was conducted of African American children who were adopted by two types of middle-class families: one white and the other African American. The study found those African American children adopted by white families scored significantly better on the W.I.S.C. test. The 13.5 point difference between the two groups of African American children mirrors the gap in W.I.S.C. scores between whites and African Americans in the larger society (Moore 1985).

A study of socialization practices found that fewer analytic and self-dependent skills were being fostered in Hispanic homes in comparison with socialization practices in Anglo-American homes (Bermudez 1986). This finding supports other studies that conclude that Hispanic students are less numerous among field-independent learners.

Another student characteristic that affects academic achievement is locus of control. Students with an internal locus of control feel better able to affect their environment. Con-

versely, those with an external locus of control are more likely to feel that factors that influence their lives are controlled by outside forces. When this topic has been related to the socioeconomic status of students, it was found that higher-SES students are more likely to have an internal locus of control than lower-SES students. In turn, an internal locus of control has also been found to correlate positively with higher academic achievement in our nation's schools (Leftcourt 1982).

When you summarize the student characteristics that currently correlate with high academic achievement (i.e. field-independent learner, white, middle/upper class, internal locus of control), it becomes evident that these are not the characteristics that abound in the most rapidly growing segments of this nation's public-school students. Without significant changes in the *modus operandi* of schools, the consequences for the twenty-first century will be daunting.

CONCLUSION

American education must make significant adjustments to meet the challenge of the demographic changes of the twenty-first century. The cultural and ethnic differences between our teacher and student populations are diverging. We cannot continue to assume that all current practices are appropriate, especially in light of the school failure rates for students of color that are frequently more than twice those found for mainstream students.

One place to begin this change is in teacher-education programs. Traditionally, prospective teachers learned about the role of culture in education either vicariously or on the job. Many universities have multicultural education components in their teacher-education programs, but these institutions are currently the exception rather than the rule. Ideally, teachers should enter the profession with a sufficient knowledge of the research base in education so they can relate their activities in the classroom to it. Teachers with these abilities would truly "practice" their

profession in a manner more analogous to that of other professionals. This research base should include thorough familiarity with how race, ethnic background, socioeconomic status, gender, and exceptionality interact with the learning process.

A strong component of teacher education should be aimed at assessing a candidate's level of multicultural functioning, with specific strategies for developing respectful and caring attitudes toward all students. Currently, even though teacher attitude is a major factor in the learning process, only in extreme cases would biased perspectives cause teacher candidates to fail to complete their certification programs.

Colleges of education also need to help future teachers develop teaching skills that are relational and cooperative as well as factual and analytical. (Equal time and attention should be paid to the former and to the latter.) Prospective teachers need to internalize the notion that the educational product is much more significant than the educational process. If traditional teaching approaches are not yielding satisfactory results, teachers should not be reluctant to restructure their methods.

School systems across this nation that have not already done so should examine their curricula to see whether or not they present content that incorporates multicultural perspectives. When those perspectives are integrated and permeate entire curricula, they also create an interesting side effect: prejudice reduction. That is certainly another worthy objective for our schools.

It has now become common for educators and community leaders to advocate that global literacy should be a product of American education. The economic impact of not having an internationally literate populace in a global economy is self-evident. However, many have not realized that before persons can be literate in the cultural contexts of other nations, they must first be cognizant of the cultural diversity within their own society. In other words, multicultural literacy is a precursor to being globally literate. The economic value of multicultural

literacy will, in time, become as obvious as that of global sophistication.

Public school systems in this nation need to provide incentives for veteran teachers to become familiar with the research base in multicultural education, either through workshops or the recertification process. Nearly all teachers in our schools are interested in improving the level of their practice if new information is presented concisely and in relation to classroom activity. Teachers and administrators must be able to analyze their schools' atmosphere, curriculum, and evaluation practices through multicultural perspectives. If these elements are found lacking, changes should be made.

Finally, educators need to redouble efforts aimed toward students who are malcontent with school or who feel hopeless in their efforts to gain an education. Those pupils need to feel that we, their teachers, believe there are no disposable students.

REFERENCES

Banks, J. 1988. *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bermudez, A. 1986. Examining the effects of home training on problem-solving styles. E.R.I.C., ED 187107.

Brophy, J. and Good, T. 1974. *Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cohen, E. 1986. *Designing group work-strategies for the heterogeneous classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ford, M. 1979. The development of an instrument for assessing levels of ethnicity in public school teachers. Ed.D. diss., University of Houston.

Frederick, W. 1977. The use of classroom time in high schools above or below the mean reading score. *Urban Education* 11 (4): 459–64.

Goodlad, J. 1984. *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Henry, W.A. 1990. Beyond the melting pot. *Time* 135 (15): 28.

Leftcourt, H.M. 1982. *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Moore, E.G. 1985. Ethnicity as a variable in child development. In *The social and affective development of black children*, edited by M. G. Spencer, G.K. Brooklins, and W.R. Allen, 101–115. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ramirez, M. and Price-Williams, D.R. 1974. Cognitive styles of children of three ethnic groups in the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 5(2): 212–219.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. 1968. *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sedlack, M.; Wheeler, C.W.; Pullin, D.W.; and Cusick, P.M. 1986. *Selling students short.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Slavin, R.E. 1983. *Cooperative learning.* New York: Longman Publishers.

Stanovick, K. 1986. Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly* 21(4): 360–407.

Walberg, H. 1984. Improving the productivity of America's schools. *Educational Leadership* 41(8): 19–27.

22

Chapter 2

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: NATURE, CHALLENGES, AND OPPORTUNITIES

by James A. Banks

A great deal of confusion exists, among both educators and the general public, about the meaning of multicultural education. Conceptions of multicultural education range from "teaching about people in other lands" to "educating African-American students about their own ancestry—but teaching them little about the Western heritage of the United States."

This confusion over the meaning of multicultural education was epitomized by a question an editor of a national education publication asked me recently. She asked: "What is the difference between multicultural education, ethnocentric education, and global education?" Later during our conversation, I discovered that she had meant "Afrocentric education" rather than "ethnocentric education." But to her, these terms were synonymous.

THE MEANING AND GOALS OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

A major source of confusion over the meaning of multicultural education is the professional literature itself. Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant (1987), in their comprehensive survey of the literature on multicultural education, found that

the term was given diverse meanings. The only commonality the various definitions shared was their view that multicultural education is a reform movement designed to improve schooling for students of color.

To advance the field and to reduce the multiple meanings of multicultural education, scholars need to develop a higher level of consensus about what the term means. Such agreement is beginning to form among academics. The consensus centers around a primary goal for multicultural education, which is to increase educational equality for both gender groups, for students from diverse ethnic and cultural groups, and for exceptional students (Banks and Banks 1989; Sleeter and Grant 1988).

A major assumption of this concept is that some groups of students, because their cultural characteristics are more consistent with the school's culture, norms, and expectations, have greater opportunities for academic success than students whose cultures are less consistent with these factors. Lower-class, African American males, for example, tend to have more problems in schools than middle-class Anglo-American males.

Increasing educational equality for students from diverse groups requires significant school restructuring. That means changing some of the basic assumptions, beliefs, and structures within schools, such as tracking and the ways in which educators interpret and use mental-ability tests. It means developing new paradigms about the ways students learn, about human ability, and about the nature of knowledge (Gardner 1983; Gould 1981). And it means hiring teachers who believe that all students can learn, regardless of their social-class or ethnic group, and that knowledge is a social construction that has social, political, and normative assumptions (Berger and Luckman 1966). Implementing this type of education within a school is a continuous process that cannot be completed within a few weeks or over several years. It requires a long-term commitment to school improvement and restructuring.

Another important goal of multicultural education, acknowledged by authorities in the field but neither understood

24

nor appreciated by many teachers, journalists, and the public, is to help all students, including white mainstream students, develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they will need to survive and function effectively in a culturally diverse society. By the year 2000, one out of every three people in the United States will be a person of color. Our survival as a strong and democratic nation depends upon our students' ability to function in a culturally diverse society. As Martin Luther King, Jr., said so eloquently: "We will live together as brothers and sisters or die separate and apart as strangers"(King 1987).

This focus of multicultural education is related to an important goal of global education. Global education seeks to help students develop cross-cultural competency in cultures beyond our national boundaries and to acquire the insights needed to recognize that all peoples living on Earth have highly interconnected fates. Citizens who have an understanding and empathy for the cultures within their own society are probably more likely to function effectively in cultures outside of their nation than citizens who do not have this knowledge.

Although multicultural and global education share some important aims, in practice, global education can hinder teaching about ethnic and cultural diversity in the United States. Some teachers are more comfortable teaching about Mexico than about Mexican Americans who live within their own cities and states. Other teachers as well as some textbook publishers do not differentiate between multicultural and global education. Although the goals of the two are complementary, they need to be distinguished, both conceptually and in practice.

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IS FOR ALL STUDENTS

We need to think seriously about why multicultural educators have not been more successful in conveying to teachers, journalists, and the general public the idea that multicultural education is concerned not only with students of

color but with white mainstream students. It is also not widely recognized that many of the reforms designed to increase the academic achievement of students of color, such as a pedagogy that is sensitive to student learning styles and cooperative-learning techniques, will also help white mainstream students to increase their academic achievement and to develop more positive intergroup attitudes and values (Slavin 1983; Shade 1988).

Multicultural education must be conceptualized as a strategy for all students for several important reasons. American schools are not working well for most students, as the comparison of the academic performance of U.S. students with students from Germany, Korea, and Japan on international achievement tests indicate. Most students of color (with the important exception of some Asian students) and lower-income students are more dependent on the school for academic achievement than are white middle-class students for a variety of complex reasons. However, school restructuring is needed for all students, due to the current ineffectiveness of today's school systems. (The National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983).

Multicultural education should also be conceptualized as a strategy for all students because it will become institutionalized and supported in the nation's schools, colleges, and universities only to the extent that it is perceived as universal and in the broad public interest. An ethnic-specific notion of multicultural education stands little chance of success and implementation in the nation's educational institutions.

CHALLENGES TO THE ANGLOCENTRIC CURRICULUM

Some readers might rightly argue that an ethnic-specific curriculum already exists in the nation's educational institutions and that it is Eurocentric, Western-oriented, and male-dominated. I would agree with this claim, but I believe that the days for the primacy and dominance of the Anglocentric

curriculum are limited. An Anglocentric education dictated our past, but will not dominate our future. The Anglocentric curriculum that is institutionalized within our nation's schools, colleges, and universities is being seriously challenged today and will continue to be tested until it is revised to accurately reflect the experiences, voices, and struggles of people of color, women, and other cultural and social groups in American society.

The idea that only an inclusive multicultural education can become institutionalized needs further discussion because an Anglocentric curriculum dominates today's schools and universities. However, its pervasiveness is much less complete and tenacious than it was before the civil-rights and women's-rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s. The historical, social, and economic factors are different today from what they were when Anglo-Americans established control over the nation's major social, economic, and political institutions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The economic, demographic, and ideological factors that led to the establishment of Anglo-hegemony early in our nation's history are changing even though Anglo-Americans are still politically, economically, and culturally dominant.

Nevertheless, there are signs throughout U.S. society that Anglo-dominance and hegemony is being challenged. Groups such as African Americans and Mexican Americans are increasingly demanding full structural inclusion and a reformulation of the canon used to select content for the school, college, and university curriculum. Many compassionate and informed whites are joining these people of color to support reforms in the nation's social, economic, political, and educational institutions. Therefore, it would be a mistake to perceive today's reform movements as confrontations between people of color and whites.

One of the pervasive myths within our society is that whites are a monolithic group. In fact, the word *white* conceals more than it reveals. Whites are a very diverse group in terms of ethnic and cultural characteristics, political affiliations, and

27

attitudes toward ethnic and cultural diversity. Many whites today, as well as historically, have supported social movements to increase the rights of African Americans and other people of color. Reform-oriented white citizens who are pushing for a more equitable and just society are an important factor that will make it increasingly difficult for the Anglo-Saxon vision to continue to dominate our educational institutions.

Whites today are playing an important role in social-reform movements and in the election of African American politicians. Governor Douglas Wilder in Virginia, Mayor David N. Dinkins in New York, and Mayor Norm Rice in Seattle, Washington, could not have been elected without substantial support from white voters. Many white students on university campuses are forming coalitions with students of color to demand that the university curriculum be reformed to include content about people of color and women. These student movements have experienced major victories, and the list of universities that have implemented ethnic-studies requirements grows longer each day. It includes the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, the University of California-Berkeley, and the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor.

Demographers project that students of color will make up about 46 percent of the nation's school-age youths (ages 0 to 17) by 2020 (Pallas, Natriello, and McDill 1989). The Anglocentric curriculum needs to be reformed to include the voices and experiences of a range of ethnic and cultural groups. The significant percentage of people of color, including African Americans and Hispanics, who are in positions of leadership in educational institutions will continue to work to get the experiences of their people integrated into the school and university curriculum. These individuals include researchers, professors, administrators, and authors of textbooks. Students of color will continue to form coalitions with reform-oriented white students and demand that the school and university curriculum be reformed to reflect the ethnic and cultural reality of American life. Parents and community groups will continue to seek a

28

school and university curriculum that gives voice to their experiences and struggles. African-American parents and community groups are the major agents pushing for a curriculum that reflects African civilizations and experimental schools for black males (Chmelynski 1990).

Feminists also will continue to challenge the Anglocentric curriculum because they view it as male-oriented, patriarchal, and sexist. And significantly, much of the new research in women's studies deals with the cultures of women of color (Jones 1985).

THE CHALLENGE TO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

I have argued that an ethnic-specific version of multicultural education is not likely to become institutionalized within the nation's schools, colleges, and universities, and that the days of Anglo-hegemony in the U.S. curriculum are limited. This is admittedly a long view of our society and future. Currently, multicultural education is facing a strenuous and well-orchestrated challenge from conservative groups and scholars. This fierce, and at times pernicious, challenge will take diverse forms, expressions, and shapes.

I believe that some of the misunderstandings surrounding multicultural education result from attempts by neoconservative scholars to portray it as a movement against Western civilization, as antiwhite, and by implication, anti-American (Ravitch 1990; Sirkin 1990). The popular press frequently calls the movement to infuse an African perspective into the curriculum *Afrocentric*, and it has defined the term to mean an education that excludes whites and Western civilization (Daley 1990).

Afrocentric has different meanings to different people. Because of these diverse interpretations, neoconservative scholars have focused many of their criticisms of multicultural education on this concept. Molefi Kete Asante (1987) defines Afrocen-

tricity as "placing African ideals at the center of any analysis that involves African culture and behavior" (p. 6). In other words, he defines Afrocentricity as looking at African and African American behavior from an African or African American perspective. His definition suggests that Black English, or *Ebonics*, cannot be understood unless it is viewed from the perspective of those who speak it. Afrocentricity, when Asante's definition is used, can describe the addition of an African American perspective to the school and university curriculum. When understood in this way, it is consistent with a multicultural curriculum because both require students to view behavior, concepts, and issues from different ethnic and cultural perspectives.

THE CANON BATTLE: SPECIAL INTERESTS VERSUS THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The push by people of color and by women to get their voices and experiences institutionalized within the curriculum and its canon transformed has evoked a strong reaction from neoconservative scholars. Consequently, a battle among these groups is taking place. The neoconservatives have founded two organizations to resist multicultural education: the Madison Center and the National Association of Scholars. Their position against multicultural education has been expressed strongly in a recent series of editorials and articles in popular and educational publications. (Ravitch 1990a; Ravitch 1990b; Finn 1990; McConnell and Breindel 1990; Leo 1989).

Many of the arguments in these editorials and articles are smoke screens for a conservative political agenda designed to promote dominant-group hegemony and the interests of a small elite. A clever tactic of the neoconservative scholars is to portray their own interests as universal and in the public good, while calling the interests of women and people of color *special interests* that are particularistic (Ravitch 1990b; Finn 1990). When a dominant elite describes its interests as the same as those of the

public, it marginalizes the experiences of structurally excluded groups, such as women and people of color.

Special interest implies a particular interest inconsistent with the overarching goals and needs of the nation-state or commonwealth. To be in the public good, interests must extend beyond the needs of a unique or specific group. But it is important to identify who formulates the criteria for determining what is a special interest. Because the dominant group has already shaped the curriculum, institutions, and structures in its images and interests, it views its interests not as special, but as identical with the common good. Special interests, as seen by of those who control the curriculum and other institutions within society, are therefore those that challenge their power, ideologies, and paradigms, particularly if the interest group demands that the canons, assumptions, and values of the institutions be transformed.

However, only a curriculum that reflects the experiences and interests of a wide range of groups in the U.S. and the world is in the national interest and therefore consistent with the public good. Any other kind of curriculum reflects a special interest and is detrimental to the needs of a nation that must survive in a pluralistic and highly interdependent world. Special-interest history and literature, such as history and literature that emphasize the primacy of the West and the history of European American males, undermines the public good because it will not help students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for survival in the twenty-first century.

An important aim of ethnic-studies and women-studies movements is to reform the curriculum so that it will be more truthful, more inclusive, and more reflective of the histories and experiences of the diverse groups and cultures that make up American society. Rather than being special-interest reform movements, these groups contribute to the democratization of the school and university curriculum. They support the public good rather than the strengthening of special interests.

We need to rethink concepts such as *special interests*, the *national interest*, and the *public good*, and to identify which groups are using these terms and for what purposes. We must also evaluate the use of these terms in the context of a nation and world that are rapidly changing. Powerless and excluded groups accurately perceive efforts to label their visions and experiences as *special interests* as an attempt to make their voices silent and their faces invisible.

SCHOOL KNOWLEDGE AND MULTICULTURAL LITERACY

Our concept of cultural literacy should be broader than the one presented by E.D. Hirsch in his widely discussed book, *Cultural Literacy*. He depicts knowledge as neutral and static, and his book contains a list of important facts that he believes students should master in order to become culturally literate. Knowledge, however, is dynamic, changing, and constructed within a social context, not neutral and static as Hirsch implies. He recommends transmitting knowledge in a largely uncritical way. But when we help students to learn, we should teach them to recognize that knowledge reflects the social context in which it is created and that it has normative and value assumptions.

I agree with Hirsch that there is a need for all U.S. citizens to have a common core of knowledge. However, the important question is: *Who will participate in the formulation of that knowledge, and whose interests will it serve?* A variety of people must participate in the identification, construction, and formulation of the information that we expect all of our citizens to master. This knowledge should reflect cultural democracy and serve the needs of all of the people. It should contribute to public virtue and the public good, and it cannot serve only the needs of dominant and powerful groups, as much of it currently does. Rather, it should reflect the experiences of all of the nation's citizens and should empower all people to participate effectively in a democratic society.

A TRANSFORMED CURRICULUM AND MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES

Educators use several approaches to integrate cultural content into the school and university curriculum (Banks, 1991; Banks 1988). Among these is the *contributions approach*, in which content about ethnic and cultural groups are limited primarily to holidays and celebrations, such as Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Birthday and Women's History Week. This approach is used often in the primary and elementary grades.

Another frequently used approach to integrate cultural content into the curriculum is the *additive approach.* In this method, cultural content, concepts, and themes are added to the curriculum without changing its basic structure, purposes, and characteristics. The additive approach is often accomplished by inserting a multicultural unit or course into an otherwise unchanged curriculum.

Neither the contributions nor the additive approach challenges the basic structure or canon of the curriculum. Cultural celebrations, activities, and content are inserted into the curriculum within its existing framework and assumptions. When these approaches are used, the selection of people, events, and interpretations related to ethnic groups and women often reflect the norms and values of the dominant culture rather than those of cultural communities. Consequently, most of the additions reflect the values and roles of the dominant culture. Men and women who challenged the *status quo* and established institutions are less likely to be selected for inclusion into the curriculum. Thus, Sacajawea, who helped whites to conquer Indian lands, is more likely to be chosen for inclusion than Geronimo, who resisted the takeover of Indian lands by whites.

The *transformation approach* differs fundamentally from the contributions and additive approaches. It changes the canon, paradigms, and basic assumptions of the curriculum and enables students to view concepts, issues, themes, and problems from different perspectives. Important goals of this approach include

33

helping students to understand concepts, events, and people from diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives and to understand knowledge as a social construction. In this approach, students are able to read and listen to the voices of the victors and the vanquished. They also analyze the teacher's perspective on events and situations and are given the opportunity to formulate and justify their own versions of them. A key aim of the transformation approach is to teach students to think critically and to develop the skills to formulate, document, and justify their conclusions and generalizations.

When using the transformation approach to teach a unit such as "The Westward Movement," the teacher would assign appropriate readings and then ask the students such questions as: What do you think "The Westward Movement" means? Who was moving West, the whites or the Indians? What region in the United States was referred to as the West? Why? The point of these questions is to help students to understand that "The Westward Movement" is a Eurocentric term because the Lakota Sioux were already living in the West and consequently were not moving. This phrase is used to refer to the movement of the European Americans who were headed in the direction of the Pacific Ocean. Furthermore, the Sioux did not consider their homeland the West, but the center of the universe.

The teacher could also ask the student to describe the Westward Movement from the point of view of the Sioux. The students might use such titles as "The End," "The Age of Doom," or "The Coming of the People Who Took Our Land." The teacher could also ask the students to give the unit a name that is more neutral than "The Westward Movement." They might name the unit,"The Meeting of Two Cultures."

The *decision-making and social-action* approach extends the transformative curriculum by enabling students to pursue projects and activities that allow them to take personal, social, and civic actions related to the concepts, problems, and issues they have studied. For example, after studying different perspectives on "The Westward Movement," the students might

decide that they want to learn more about contemporary American Indians and to take actions that will enable the school to depict and perpetuate more accurate and positive views of America's first inhabitants. The students might decide to view a popular film such as *Dances With Wolves* and to discuss the extent to which it gives an accurate depiction of American Indian-white relationships. They might also compile a list of books written by American Indians for the school librarian to order and present a pageant for the school's morning exercise entitled: "The Westward Movement: A View From the Other Side."

CONCLUSION

Multicultural education is necessary to help all of the nation's future citizens acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to survive in the twenty-first century. Nothing less than the nation's survival is at stake. The rapid growth in the nation's population of people of color, the escalating importance of nonwhite nations such as China and Japan, and the widening gap between the rich and the poor make it essential for our future citizens to have multicultural literacy and cross-cultural skills. In the twenty-first century, a nation whose citizens cannot negotiate on the world's multicultural global stage will be tremendously disadvantaged, and its very survival will be imperiled.

REFERENCES

Asante, M.K. 1987. *The Afrocentric idea.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Banks, J.A. 1988. Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Multicultural Leader* 1 (2): 1–3

Banks, J.A. 1991. *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies.* 5th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J.A. and Banks, C.A. 1989. *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Berger, P.L. and Luckman, T. 1966. *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* New York: Doubleday.

35

Chmelynski, C. 1990. Controversy attends schools with all-black, all-male classes. *The Executive Educator* 12 (10): 16–18.

Daley, S. 1990. Inspirational history draws academic fire. *The New York Times*, 10 October.

Finn, C.E. 1990. Why can't colleges convey our diverse culture's unifying theme? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 13 June 40.

Gardner, H. 1983. *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Gould, S.J. 1981. *The mismeasure of man.* New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Hirsch, E.D. 1987. *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin and Co.

Jones, J. 1985. *Labor of love, labor of sorrow: Black women, work, and the family from slavery to the present.* New York: Basic Books.

King, Martin Luther, Jr.; selected by Coretta Scott King. 1987. *The words of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Newmarket Press.

Leo, J. 1989. Teaching history the way it happened. *U.S. News and World Report*, 27 November 73.

McConnell, S. and Breindel, E. 1990. Head to come. *The New Republic*, 8 January 1990, 19–21.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Pallas, A.M.; Natriello, G.; and McDill, E.L. 1989. The changing nature of the disadvantaged population: current dimensions and future trends. *Educational Researcher* 18 (5): 16–22, ff. 46–48.

Ravitch, D. 1990a. Diversity and democracy: Multicultural education in America. *American Educator*, Spring 16–20.

Ravitch, D. 1990b. Multiculturalism yes, particularism no. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 24 October.

Shade, B.J. Robinson, ed. 1989. *Culture, style, and the educative process.* Springfield, Il.: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.

Sirkin, G. 1990. The multiculturalists strike again. *The Wall Street Journal*, 18 January 1990.

Slavin, R. 1983. *Cooperative learning.* New York: Longman Publishers.

Sleeter, C.E. and Grant, C.A. 1987. An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review* 57 (4): 421–44.

Sleeter, C.E. and Grant, C.A. 1988. *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender.* Columbus, Oh.: Merrill Publishing Co.

Chapter 3

EFFECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICES FOR MULTICULTURAL CLASSROOMS

by Geneva Gay

When teachers are challenged to be more sensitive to cultural pluralism in their teaching, they frequently respond with: "Tell us what to do, and we will do it." Undoubtedly, the demand for multicultural awareness, and the needs of teachers who are trying to meet these demands, will continue—even accelerate—as the magnitude of cultural differences between students and teachers increase, as traditional instructional efforts become less effective, and as teachers experience increasing frustrations and doubts about teaching culturally different populations. While it is tempting to respond to this situation with lists of classroom practices and strategies, yielding too quickly to this temptation is problematic. It may transmit misconceptions and feed fallacious assumptions that effective multicultural education can be implemented easily and expeditiously with little professional preparation.

In fact, achieving teaching effectiveness in multicultural classrooms is far more complicated and demanding than that. It involves three major types of tasks. One has to do with the process of making decisions; another involves assessing the adequacy of the decisions made; and the third deals with how to place multicultural interventions into the proper scope, sequence, and context of other classroom operations.

It is not enough to merely compile catalogs of learning activities, resources, and materials about a variety of ethnic and cultural groups' heritages, histories, experiences, and perspectives. However good these aids are, they are never good enough for most teachers and classroom situations. They tend to be

38

overly general, reflective of their creators' personal preferences and idiosyncracies, and quickly outdated, making their use limited to specific classrooms. Furthermore, catalog listings *per se* of multicultural strategies and activities do not adequately inform potential users about how the ideas and techniques evolved or how to improve the quality of their own pedagogical decision-making skills. They attempt to answer the question of *which* multicultural practices are best without explaining *how* the answers were derived. Rather than teaching teachers how to make quality multicultural education decisions for themselves and the particulars of their own circumstances, catalog listings of strategies may inadvertently perpetuate a sense of personal powerlessness, disownership, and intimidation among classroom teachers.

CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION

To break this cycle of dependency, and to achieve greater instructional success in multicultural classrooms, teachers need to learn how to make decisions about what is best for their given place, time, and circumstances with respect to cultural diversity. This chapter attempts to respond to this need. It endorses the principle of *multicultural infusion* and proposes that it can be successfully implemented by empowering teachers with multicultural education decision-making skills.

Two additional guidelines underline the ideas discussed and proposals made in this chapter. First, instructional decision-making should honor the key definitions, concepts, goals, and beliefs of multicultural education. This requires some fundamental knowledge and understanding of its basic content, conventions, and convictions. For example, advocates generally agree that while multicultural, global, and international education are similar and complementary in spirit and principle, they are not identical. Thus, teaching about Japan, Africa, or Mexico is not the same as teaching about the Japanese American, African American, or Mexican American experience. Multicultural

education is concerned primarily with ethnically and culturally different issues within a national context. Fundamentally, it is an affective endeavor, with social reform in schools and society as its ultimate outcome. Therefore, simply teaching factual information about different ethnic and cultural groups' histories, contributions, and experiences, or merely adding multicultural materials to existing school and classroom structures, is not enough. Rather, effective multicultural education requires that values analysis, institutional and attitudinal reform, and social action accompany the acquisition of factual knowledge.

Second, multicultural education should not enter into classroom instruction capriciously, haphazardly, or incidentally. Some carefully conceived and well-planned schemata should be used to govern its *deliberate* and *systematic* inclusion. Several possible schemes are available from scholarly literature. (Banks 1989; Sleeter and Grant 1988; Bennett 1990). However, these frameworks apply more to program planning and curriculum development than to classroom instruction. They are more *conceptual* than *functional* or *operational.* That is, they suggest what should be done and why, but do not explain, with sufficient procedural clarity, how to translate the prescriptions into actual behaviors within the context of real classroom interactions.

Experts contend that because all students need to develop attitudes and skills for living in a culturally, racially, socially, and ethnically pluralistic society and world, multicultural education should be integrated into the learning experiences of all students, in all subjects, at every grade level. But teachers need to know more than this if they are to act upon these suggestions. They must know how to connect these theoretical proposals to the functional operations of their classroom practices. Because learning experiences are dynamic and constantly changing, responding to the "how-to" needs of multicultural teaching with only *product* answers (examples of "what to do") is insufficient. A more effective approach is for teachers to learn how high-quality multicultural teaching practices are developed and

how this process can be implemented in their own classrooms. This approach might be called *contextual decision-making.*

Any problem-solving or decision-making process begins with acknowledging and identifying specific problems or situations that require a change in current behavior. After establishing awareness, the problem situation needs to be carefully analyzed to determine its nature and elements, alternative solutions or decisions, and ways to evaluate appropriate options for the given circumstances. Therefore, before quality decisions can be made about what teaching practices are best suited for multicultural classrooms, those aspects of teaching that are most problematic must be identified. This can be accomplished by (1) using *systems thinking* to analyze the structural and procedural elements of routine teaching tasks and functions; (2) identifying the conflict points between these regular functions and their operations in multicultural classrooms; and (3) making decisions and choices about the kinds of changes necessary to resolve these conflicts.

DETERMINING NEEDS

Systems thinking and structural analysis consist of identifying observable uniformities or patterns, functions, and interactions between structures and functions that exist in a phenomenon being studied (Levy 1968). When applied to teaching, these analyses are somewhat analogous to constructing an anatomy of the process. The act of teaching is dissected to discern and describe the characteristics of the structures, tasks, and activities teachers employ habitually in the day-to-day operations of instructional functions. It is similar to, but more inclusive than, techniques that have been used in classroom interaction analysis research. John Goodlad (1984) and his associates used systems thinking and structural and functional analyses in their study of schooling. They conducted site observations in the order to describe the interactive processes evident in actual classrooms, and to deduce from them "who . . .

was doing what . . . to whom . . . how . . . and in what context" (p. 226).

Systems thinking about and structural analysis of teaching are based on several assumptions. These are: (1) the process or act of teaching includes some common tasks and functions that prevail across time, place, setting, circumstance, and individual teacher-characteristics; (2) these functions are systematic, habitual, and occur with a high degree of regularity; (3) they have substantive, organizational, and procedural traits; and (4) most, if not all, regular teaching functions have direct implications for multicultural education reform.

These assumptions are supported by the thinking and research of other educators as well. Steven Bossert (1979) suggests that every classroom activity can be described according to its structural and functional characteristics. Goodlad (1984) found some strikingly similar patterns of teaching functions and behaviors across teachers, grade levels, and subjects. Raymond Adams (1970) contends that the classroom is a social and behavioral setting with its own rituals, rules, regularities, and persistent patterns of behavior.

These claims can be extended to yet another level of operations. Not only is teaching a system, but there are other systems (or subsystems) within it, each of which has its own system. Classroom management, feedback provisions, performance appraisal, curriculum design, and classroom discourse are persistent components of teaching. None of these is monolithic or unidimensional. Instead, each has its own elements, structures, and regularities. For example, classroom discourse includes, among other things, who talks when and how, vocabulary, questioning strategies, use of time and space, relationship between speaker and listener, wait-time for responses, and turn-taking rules. Feedback encompasses frequency, quality, praise, encouragement, criticism, prompts and cues, extending student responses, and how these are distributed among students.

Analyses of these various levels of systems in teaching can identify patterns of activities, tasks, relationships, and interac-

tions that comprise the mainstay of classroom instruction and can determine how different students experience the learning environment. Once identified, those in need of change can be more effectively remediated. As Bryce Hudgins (1971) suggests, "teachers must understand how classrooms function if they are to operate effectively and comfortably in them .... such understanding is a prerequisite to the design and implementation of reasoned and viable educational change" (p. 71).

Several different classification schemes are available for viewing teaching systematically and analytically. Individually and collectively, they describe teaching as including methodological, organizational, and managerial tasks; having *preactive* (preparatory) and *interactive* (face-to-face encounters) components; involving *logical* (thinking and reasoning), *strategic* (planning, organizing, and directing), and *institutional* (keeping records, chaperoning, etc.) acts; and unfolding through a progressional sequence of review, presentation-guided learning practice, corrective feedback, supervision of independent practice, performance assessment, and reteaching (Haysom 1985; Hudgins 1971; Jackson 1968; Rosenshine and Stevens 1986).

A composite profile of teaching functions emerges from further explanations of these general characteristics. All teachers, in some form or another:

- Develop and administer instructional plans;
- Set goals and objectives;
- Select content and skills to be taught;
- Create climates and environments for learning;
- Establish relationships with students;
- Teach social and academic skills;
- Choose instructional materials, teaching techniques, and learning activities;
- Appraise pupil performance;
- Provide feedback in the form of praise, encouragement, and criticism;
- Group students for instruction;

43

- Arrange time and space for learning;
- Model and transmit values, beliefs, and norms about social decorum, knowledge acquisition, and codes of acceptable behavior;
- Develop and transmit expectations for and standards of performance;
- Discipline and manage student behavior.

Within and across each of these general functions some specific structures and behaviors predominate. Among these are the passive role of students, whole-group instruction, teacher control, and teacher talk. An emotional tone prevails in most classrooms that might best be described as "flat" in that it is neither harsh and punitive, warm and joyful, passionate and compassionate, nor exhilarating and engaging (Goodlad 1984). According to Goodlad (1984) regardless of what approaches are used to describe and understand what routinely goes on in the classroom, the teacher emerges as the coach, quarterback, referee, and even the rule-maker. But there is no team because "little or nothing about classroom life as it is conducted . . . suggests the existence of or need for norms of group cohesion and cooperation for achievement of a shared purpose." He adds further that "the most successful classrooms may be those in which teachers succeed in creating commonly shared goals and individuals cooperate in ensuring each person's success in achieving them. The ultimate criterion becomes group accomplishment of individual progress. But this would be countervailing to prevailing practice" (p. 108). In the remainder of this chapter, several examples are used to demonstrate how systems thinking about teaching functions operates, and the types of instructional possibilities it can generate for multicultural classrooms.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICES

This section takes four major teaching functions and

shows how to use systems thinking and structural analysis to develop instructional change strategies for each. The four functions are: managing instruction through teacher talk, providing students with conceptual examples, transforming curriculum, and creating classroom climates for learning. All four functions play a significant role in the overall instructional process. They also are consistent with the underlying message of infusion as the best way to determine the placement and alignment of multiculturalism in the total educational enterprise. In other words, they support the belief that multicultural education initiatives should impact the significant, mainstream, and regular operations of the classroom, instead of be relegated to the insignificant and peripheral aspects, or be reserved for special occasions.

Teacher Talk

When it comes to classroom discourse, teachers dominate the verbal scene and control the verbal opportunities and tasks of students. They do this through their own verbal initiations and determinations of who else will talk, when, and under what circumstances (Cazden 1986). Hudgins (1971) declares that "someone is talking in classrooms about two-thirds of the time, and about two-thirds of that time it is the teacher" (p. 71). Teachers spend great amounts of time informing, telling, explaining, demonstrating, questioning, illustrating, directing, controlling, monitoring, evaluating, and modeling. Obviously, then, teacher talk should be high among the priority areas targeted for change in developing effective teaching strategies for multicultural classrooms.

Thomas Hurt, Michael Scott, and James McCroskey (1978) argue that effective communication is the single most important prerequisite to successful teaching and learning. Sociolinguistic research provides several different structural, substantive, and procedural components of classroom communication between students and teachers that affect the kinds of

opportunities culturally different students receive to participate in the instructional process. They are turn-taking rules, attending and attention-giving behaviors, wait-time for responses, length of speech exchanges, questioning strategies, and feedback mechanisms. Teachers assume that only they have the power and authority to grant permission for students to engage in classroom discourse, and that a single set of rules governing the participation apply identically to all students in virtually every situation. Among these rules are: (1) serialized turn-taking with "only one speaker at a time"; (2) students raising hands and waiting to be recognized by the teacher before talking; (3) maintaining eye contact with the teacher as a sign of paying attention; (4) posing questions to specifically targeted individuals instead of to the group as a whole; and (5) creating a dichotomous relationship between speaking and listening in which the listener assumes a passive, receptive posture. Teachers also tend to use rather lengthy speech segments in giving information and instructions, but they provide small amounts of wait-time for students to formulate and present responses. Questions that require higher-order thinking skills, physical action, and genuine affective reactions are used infrequently, and rarely is anything more than perfunctory praise and encouragement given to students on their contributions.

Some culturally different students find these rules of behavior prohibitive to their classroom participation because they are not compatible with their own cultural rules of communication. For example, eye aversion is practiced among all major groups of color in the United States as deference to authority. Many students from these groups will not look directly at teachers when they are talking. Yet they can be listening intently. Asian Americans, Native Americans, and children whose first language is not English may require more wait-time to provide responses than teachers routinely give because of their cultural socialization and the processes involved in foreign language production. African American and Hispanic speakers are very dramatic, emotional, and active in their responding

behaviors. These preferences may result from the prominence of story telling and affective expressions in their traditional cultures. Many youngsters want to establish personal relationships with teachers and depend upon the overt encouragement and praise of teachers to stimulate their efforts. Therefore, the "what" and "how" of teacher talk in the classroom need to be changed to reflect sensitivity to the cultural backgrounds of different students. These modifications might include:

- Extending wait-time and changing turn-taking rules to honor the timing and pacing of different ethnic and cultural groups' participation styles;
- Using alternative cues to indicate attending behaviors, such as asking students to summarize points previously made, to restate another's point of view, or to declare their personal preferences on issues under discussion;
- Shortening the length of teacher speech exchanges;
- Minimizing teacher talk through the use of more student-focused and active learning strategies, such as small-group tasks, simulations, role playing, dramatic readings, and cooperative learning;
- Providing opportunities for students to establish, monitor, manage, and correct their own rules of classroom discourse;
- Allowing the naturalistic discourse patterns of different cultural groups to operate for some instructional experiences. For example, teachers might encourage students to use cultural styles of story telling to develop and appraise translation and comprehension skills in reading, to present critical incidents in social studies, or to report the results of inquiry exercises or research topics;
- Asking more divergent, high-order cognitive and affective questions that allow all students the chance to respond, and accepting their affective reactions as

47

legitimate contributions to the learning process.

Cognitive Content of Instructional Behaviors

A careful look at how time is allotted across the content of instructional talk is as revealing as its structural characteristics. Much of the actual act of teaching is devoted to providing examples, illustrations, vignettes, scenarios, and anecdotes to demonstrate the meanings and functions of the concepts, ideas, facts, principles, and skills being taught. The process begins with naming, defining, and explaining the phenomenon being taught. All other subsequent instructional efforts are devoted to illustrating how, when, and where it operates. The examples and illustrations act as "pedagogical bridges" between what is being taught in its abstract form and its connection to the life experiences of learners. As such they are the conduits or transmitters of meaningfulness in learning. Thus, the theory of probability, a literary analogy, a moral dilemma, or the concept of interdependence become meaningful to different students to the extent that the examples used to illustrate them reflect the experiences, perspectives, and frames of references of a variety of cultural, ethnic, and social groups. When teachers fail to use culturally relevant teaching examples and illustrations, they minimize their own instructional effectiveness as well as make learning more problematic for students. Presumed "practical" examples of abstract content, concepts, principles, and skills push learning mastery even further beyond the grasp of culturally different students.

An important way to counteract negative responses and make teaching and learning more effective in multicultural classrooms is to broaden the pools of teaching examples so that they are culturally pluralistic. This requires that teachers understand the function of examples in their teaching behaviors, the types of examples they currently use, and the cultural limitations they contain. They then need to determine what

kinds of examples are best suited for different cultural groups; how to create, locate, and solicit them; and how to incorporate them into regular teaching repertoires and routines. None of these essential decisions can be made without a working knowledge of different groups' cultural traditions, value systems, learning styles, communications patterns, world views, and styles of interpersonal interactions.

Multicultural teaching examples serve many functions simultaneously. In addition to functioning as "bridges of meaningfulness" between academic abstractions and practical living, they help all students learn about cultural pluralism as they develop their academic skills; they demonstrate that cultural pluralism is a real, normative, and valued fact of daily life in the classroom; and they model how multiculturalism should (and can) penetrate the inner core of the teaching and learning processes. For example, showing how basic mathematical forms or shapes like lines, circles, squares, and triangles are applied in different types of ethnic achitecture (such as Native American long houses, Moslem mosques, Jewish synagogues, indigenous African homes, and American schools), arts, and symbols make them easier to learn for some students. Using ethnic examples of protest poetry in the process of teaching literary-criticism skills may cause some students to be more interested in and improve their mastery of the task. It also introduces all students to multicultural content within the context of studying a normal literature theme and/or genre; and it teaches several different kinds of skill development—literary criticism, critical thinking, ethnic and cultural literary, infusion of multiculturalism—simultaneously.

These illustrations demonstrate the significance of examples in teaching and the powerful potential they offer for making instruction more effective for a greater variety of students in multicultural classrooms. They work well because they validate and employ culturally different frames of reference as aides to instructional efforts while teaching students about cultural diversity in standard disciplinary frameworks.

Multicultural Curriculum Development

A third area of regular teaching behaviors that can facilitate better instruction in multicultural classrooms is curriculum development. Teachers are always designing and modifying plans for instruction. They should understand this function systematically and know how to incorporate multicultural content and perspectives within it. That is, they should be able to transform the curriculum to make it more culturally pluralistic.

Typically, curriculum as a plan for instruction includes six components—rationale, goals, objectives, content, activities, and evaluation. Materials, resources, and time lines are often included as well. These components can be further grouped by function and value into two categories. One is substantive and intrinsic; the other is methodological and instrumental. The substantive components are the achievement outcomes expected of all students. They are standards of performance and are, therefore, non-negotiable. They appear in the curriculum as goals and objectives. All other components are means, methods, and tools—instruments—to assist in the achievement of goals and objectives. They should be diversified to accommodate different cultural contexts, settings, and clients in the school, community, society, and world. That is, alternative pathways to learning should be used to achieve common performance outcomes in multicultural classrooms. Thus, rationales, content, activities, evaluation procedures, resources, materials, and time lines serve functions in planning for instruction similar to those performed by examples and illustrations in the delivery of teaching. They, too, are conduits through which intended learning becomes personally meaningful to students, and they are the components of curriculum designs most amenable to change.

Without question, all students should learn to read, write, think critically, and solve problems as well as master the disciplinary facts and principles of the subjects commonly taught in schools, such as mathematics, science, social studies, humani-

ties, fine arts, vocational education, and computer literacy. But how they should acquire these skills is less consensual. Answers to this question depend upon whom and what is being taught by whom, as well as when and where the teaching takes place. This means that curriculum content, activities, resources, and performance-appraisal procedures should be varied across and within all domains of learning in order to reflect different ethnic and cultural groups' experiences, contributions, life-styles, and learning-style preferences. Additionally, culturally different literature, arts, and aesthetics should complement factual information; more active learning, participatory partnerships, cooperative arrangements, and creative expressions should be included in learning activities; and more diverse combinations of written, oral, and kinesthetic opportunities should be provided for students to demonstrate task and skill mastery. These kinds of learning experiences are more effective for culturally different students because the content enrichment, varied formats, and multisensory stimulations they offer are more compatible with their cultural values and learning style characteristics.

Classroom Environment

Teaching involves more than creating curriculum designs and engaging in classroom discourse. Another essential component of the process is the physical, social, and interpersonal climates or environments created for learning. According to Rudolf Moos (1979), all classrooms are social environments, and they have several common dimensions: relationships among students and teachers, climate conditions, task orientation, and managerial rules and regulations. Together, these elements form the social context and stage setting for learning.

Research shows that students achieve greater satisfaction, personal growth, and levels of performance in classrooms that include high student involvement, strong personal student-teacher relationships, innovative teaching methods, clarity of rules, affective concern for students as people, and hard work for

academic rewards—all within a coherent, well-organized context (Moos 1979). These characteristics are especially significant to learning for culturally different students whose learning styles are field dependent, and whose value orientations are people-centered, affective, humanistic, and group-based. Yet in most U.S. classrooms, students operate largely on an individual basis, have a limited range of movement and involvement, and are expected to function in a rather rigidly organized and sterile physical space. Relationships between students and teachers are formal and somewhat distant, and classroom decorations are too often limited to the mechanical tools (maps, books, machinery, laboratory equipment, and so on) of various subjects areas. The notable exception is elementary classrooms, which tend to be more decorative and where students and teachers work in closer harmony with each other.

Students of some cultural and ethnic groups, especially African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Native Hawaiians, find "cold," formal, and passive learning environments formidable and disconcerting—so much so that they are distracted from concentrating on academic tasks. Whereas most mainstream schooling procedures use a linear structure (from lining up to enter and exit the classroom, to sitting in straight rows, to serialized participation in discussions, to how information is arranged and presented, to the priority given to individualistic competition), their cultural structures are circular. In learning situations, they prefer group arrangements; integration of affective, cognitive, and psychomotor responses; topic-chaining in the organization and presentation of ideas; and active interaction among all environmental factors (humans, objects, space, and emotional tone). An active and cooperative, warm and emotionally supportive environment is fundamental to their effective learning.

Given the environmental conditions that culturally different students prefer for learning, what are some specific ways in which classroom climates can be modified to embrace more multicultural principles, perspectives, and experiences? Obvi-

ously, they will vary somewhat according to the specific setting, circumstances, and people involved. The suggestions offered here serve as guidelines for helping teachers combine their knowledge of classroom-climate components and cultural pluralism to create more effective multicultural learning environments. Possible practices include:

- Using cooperative group, team, and pair arrangements for learning as the normative structure instead of as the occasional exception;
- Using learning stations, multimedia, and interactive video to present information instead of some form of lecturing;
- Varying the format of learning activities frequently to incorporate more affective responses, motion, and movement;
- Establishing friendships between students and teachers;
- Creating genuine partnerships with students so that they are active participants in making decisions about how their learning experiences will occur and be evaluated;
- Changing rules and procedures that govern life in the classroom so they reflect some of the codes of behavior and participation styles of culturally different students;
- Devising ways for students to monitor and manage their own and each other's classroom behaviors;
- Developing an *esprit de corps* of "family" to give cohesion and focused meaning to interpersonal relationships in the classroom;
- Including more human-centered and culturally different images, artifacts, experiences, and incidents in classroom decorations and as props for teaching.

CONCLUSION

The ultimate answer to creating effective instructional practices for multicultural classrooms is empowering teachers to make better decisions for themselves within their own teaching contexts. Empowerment is often interpreted as having the power and authority to make decisions. These are not at issue here. Research clearly and consistently documents the fact that teachers are the power brokers in their classrooms. As John Goodlad's study of schooling shows, the intellectual terrain of the classroom is laid out by teachers, and they play the major role in deciding what, where, when, and how students will learn. Furthermore, teachers at all levels of schooling perceive that they have significant, if not total, control over selecting teaching strategies and learning activities; evaluating students; setting goals and objectives; determining the use of classroom space; scheduling time and materials; grouping students; and selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught. They are virtually autonomous in creating the environment for learning (Goodlad 1984).

Teacher empowerment here means having the knowledge, will, and skill to incorporate cultural pluralism into all routine teaching functions. Having "the knowledge" means understanding how cultural conditioning affects the behaviors of students and teachers, being aware of the cultural contributions of different groups to the various disciplinary domains of knowledge and humankind, and knowing how various teaching tasks converge to form systems of teaching functions. Having "the will" is possessing beliefs and values that accept the legitimacy of cultural differences as well as possessing an enthusiasm to affirm, celebrate, and use these differences to enrich the educational process for all students. Having "the skill" is being competent to translate both new knowledge about multiculturalism and heightened consciousness about the nature of teaching functions into operational strategies that can

54

transform instruction into teaching practices that are more meaningful to a wider variety of students.

The effectiveness of any teaching practices in multicultural classrooms is a direct reflection of how well those aspects that need to be changed are identified and understood. Only then can decisions about *how* to make the necessary changes proceed expeditiously and coherently. Another essential test of effectiveness is the extent to which teaching behaviors combine personal caring with multicultural knowledge and technical competence in working with culturally different students.

While the specific, effective instructional practices for particular multicultural classrooms will vary by setting and circumstance, the analytical, diagnostic, and decision-making processes out of which they emerge are similar for all situations. They include a systems thinking approach to understanding routine teaching tasks and functions, and transforming them so that they incorporate information about and sensitivity to the life experiences, heritages, contributions, and learning styles of students from different ethnic, cultural, racial, and social backgrounds.

REFERENCES

Adams, R.S. 1970. The classroom context. In *Scholars in context: The effects of environments on learning*, edited by W.J. Campbell, 261–83. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Banks, J.A. 1989. Integrating the curriculum with ethnic content: Approaches and guidelines. In *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*, edited by J.A. Banks and C.A. Banks, 189–207. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, C.I. 1990. *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bossert, S.T. 1979. *Tasks and social relationship in classrooms: A study of instructional organization and its consequences*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cazden, C.B. 1986. Classroom discourse. In *Handbook of research on teaching*, 3rd ed., edited by M.C. Wittrock, 432–63. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Goodlad, J.I. 1984. *A place called school: Prospects for the future.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Haysom, J. 1985. *Inquiring into the teaching process: Toward self-evaluation and professional development.* Toronto: Ontario Institute of Studies in Education.

Hudgins, B.B. 1971. *The instructional process.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.

Hurt, H.T.; Scott, M.D.; and McCroskey, J.C. 1978. *Communication in the classroom.* Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Jackson, P.W. 1968. *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Levy, M.L. 1968. Structural-functional analysis. In *International encyclopedia of the social sciences,* Vol. 6, edited by D.L. Sills, 21–29. New York: The Free Press.

Moos, R.H. 1979. Educational climates. In *Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy, and productivity,* edited by H.J. Walberg, 79–100. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Rosenshine, B. and Stevens, R. 1986. Teaching functions. In *Handbook of research on teaching,* 3rd ed., edited by M. C. Wittrock, 376–91. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Sleeter, C.E. and Grant, C.A. 1988. *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender.* Columbus, Oh.: Merrill Publishing Co.

Chapter 4

INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE: DEVELOPING AN EFFECTIVE MULTICULTURAL SCHOOL COMMUNITY

by Valerie Ooka Pang

> Despair is paralyzing. I urge you to remember that chaotic, distressed, impoverished, and underachieving schools have been turned around by individual efforts, just as our distressed and underachieving students were able to become productive through individual efforts. I am suggesting that most schools and school systems can become more productive and happier places to be than they are right now. Nothing is wrong with public schools that programs to revitalize communities and families cannot improve through participation, cooperation, and an atmosphere of trust (Comer 1980, p.247).

In 1968, Martin Luther King, Jr., Elementary School was one of the lowest-achieving schools in New Haven, Connecticut (Comer 1988). The school was 99 percent black, and more than 70 percent of the students received Aid for Dependent Children. The school had serious discipline and attendance problems. Its students and their parents felt frustrated with and alienated from the school. And its teachers were depressed and exhausted from trying to cope within a hostile environment. But, miraculously, by 1980 students were performing above the national average in math and reading, and the attendance rate was one of the best in the district.

How did these successes occur? During 1968, the school became the focal point of university consultants, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. As these groups joined forces and discussions evolved, everyone became hopeful, and this hope

57

transferred into commitment. Administrators, teachers, parents, and students began working together with the common vision that all children have enormous potential and that all children can reach their potential. Those students and parents who once felt frustrated and alienated became actively involved in the learning process; students, in particular, challenged their teachers and themselves to know more. Teachers, in turn, rose to the challenges.

The purpose of this chapter is to focus upon the question: What are the factors that create a successful multicultural school, one where students from diverse populations exhibit competence in basic skills and where the total school environment reflects cultural diversity?

THE INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

Numerous factors contribute to an overall climate of either hope or despair in schools. School is a place where many social phenomena, such as ethnicity, economic level, and gender, meet and interact. Children may come from families that have little money, speak a language other than English, and/or have behaviors and values that differ from those of middle-class schools. District policies, school practices, faculty makeup, curriculum content, instructional strategies, and school routines may force these students to choose between cultural identity and school success. This distressing dilemma can cause them to suffer from depression, frustration, and confusion. (Fordham, 1988). In addition, school faculties may suffer from low morale, lack of respect, and a heavily burdened curriculum that requires them to deal with issues such as nuclear war, AIDS, drug abuse, teenage pregnancies, and day-care of young children.

To create successful multicultural schools, learning must be seen from an entire-system approach that: (1) promotes respect for and forges cooperation of all community-school personnel, and (2) reflects cultural diversity in its curriculum and instructional programs.

Successful characteristics of multicultural schools should not be perceived as a shopping list of research-proven factors that can be selected from the shelf, purchased, and then used. Educators and parents must engage in discussions about their vision for their school and how these characteristics work simultaneously to support a "can-do" school climate.

Before even examining these characteristics, one must recognize six important factors about the research on effective schools.

First, effective-school research literature includes studies of both high-middle class, white schools and of poor, culturally diverse schools. Initially, James Coleman was commissioned to conduct a national study of equality of educational opportunity in 1965. His research found that family background was a large determinant of school success. Many educators interpreted this to mean that schools did not have much impact on the learning process (Coleman 1966).

More recently, however, the literature on effective schools has shifted, and professionals have adopted the belief that schools can teach all children (Cohen 1987). One of the pioneers in this research was Ronald Edmonds. His studies focused attention on successful schools that served poor, culturally diverse schools. He believed that once he identified common characteristics of these successful schools, it would be possible to transfer those elements to schools that were failing their students (Edmonds 1979).

Research on thriving, culturally diverse schools centers on building supportive school communities. There is a strong sense of "we" in these schools. The collaborative effort of teachers, parents, and students working together as responsible, interdependent allies builds an educational climate that offers a predictable, encouraging, and supportive environment (Comer 1980).

Second, because schools are like people, one must recognize that every school has individual strengths and needs. Something that may be exceptionally successful at one school

may only be moderately effective in another. In reviewing the components that correlate with school success, one should remember that there is no single recipe for a healthy learning ecology. The culture of each school may differ not only in ethnicity, but also in social class, rural or urban setting, and language groups. Schools will journey toward school success on different roads and in different vehicles.

Third, one must be aware that though much of the professional literature points to correlations between various components, it does not explain cause-and-effect relationships based within well-defined theoretical models. This can limit the applicability of some effective schools literature (Comer, Haynes, and Hamilton Lee 1987–88).

Fourth, although research has provided important information about school reform, the quantitative examination of successful schools often ignores intangible and other hidden factors that contribute to achievement. They do not explore the following questions: How are working interpersonal relationships formed between teacher and parent? Between student and parent? Between teacher and administrator? How can the cultural background of students be integrated into the curriculum and instruction of schools? How do teachers acknowledge and value the life-styles that students bring to schools? How are cultural diversities seen in schools, as deficits or differences? (The differing ways in which teachers, administrators, and parents view these questions will also have definite impact upon the climate of schools.)

Fifth, one must recognize that schools are important social organizations. Schools tend to reflect mainstream values in their structures, curriculum, and interactions. The historically reinforced stratifications of American society, which are based upon level of wealth, social status, and student ethnicity, often are seen as principal determinants of school success (Wilson and Fergus 1988). School staff members should examine their own values and beliefs about student potential in light of these orientations. Do school members operate from a belief that

students from low-income, culturally diverse communities are not as capable as those from affluent, white neighborhoods? Some school staff members reinforce the social status by mirroring an overall atmosphere of schools as places where teachers "know best" about schooling and parents should not interfere in the process. Also, there are parents who send their children to school with comments like, "You don't have to listen to the teacher." This mindset may have developed from negative experiences parents had when they were in school. These attitudes will not contribute to the development of a cohesive school community.

And sixth, the movement toward effective school research, in part, represents a strong corporate agenda found in today's schools. Many of the tools that have been brought forth in school reform reflect an organizational and management orientation. Though these tools can strengthen the school structure, schools should not be equated with factories or offices. Schools are unique institutions whose purpose is to develop fulfilled, responsible citizens who are active participants in a democratic society (Goodlad 1984).

While schools want graduates to be economically self-sufficient, their principle function is not strictly to produce workers for business. The complexity of the relationship between business and schools is due in part to the assumption that the underlying economic infrastructure of society is dependent on schools to produce workers for business. Yet, if schools see their mission as preparing responsible citizens, there may be a vast difference in purpose between schools and business. Schools are not profit-driven and do not view students as commodities being produced or managed. Transferring what works in a factory or office may not always be suitable for schools.

CHARACTERISTICS THAT FOSTER SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS

The research on effective schools has been uneven, and

definitions of success vary. Yet specific characteristics emerge that seem to impact healthy school climate and academic achievement (Murphy 1989). The following such characteristics will be discussed as key to the implementation of successful schools in diverse communities:

1. The school community engages in lengthy discussions about curriculum, organizational structure, assessment instruments, and educational purpose.
2. The school community believes in the ability of all students to succeed, and this vision permeates all areas of school.
3. Parents are participating partners in schools.
4. Teachers are involved in the decision-making process.
5. The principal is a key leader in guiding and directing the collective effort of the learning community.
6. Instruction is founded on developmental and social-skill needs of students.
7. Teachers consistently monitor and reinforce student academic performance.

School Community Dialogue

Establishing dialogue between parents and school faculty as well as between faculty member and faculty member is an important first stage in constructing a cohesive school community. These ongoing, continuous discussions create trusting, interpersonal relationships among parents, teachers, and administrators, which, in turn, lead to shared vision and effective decision-making. Through this process, consistent role models at home and school develop and reinforce similar academic, behavioral, and social expectations.

Teachers who have the opportunity to discuss concerns and problems with each other are more likely to develop supportive professional networks. By sharing ideas and effective instructional approaches to curriculum and discipline problems,

62

teachers minimize individual isolation. Moreover, dialogue with parents can help to develop understanding and support for school programs. Parents become better informed about the kinds of pressures teachers face, and how they can aid teachers as volunteers and as role models at home.

High Expectations

Successful schools possess high expectations for all students. Often students from culturally diverse communities have been told through overt and covert avenues that they are not as good as white students, that they will not do well because of their background. They overhear teachers say things like, "Well, you can't expect anything from these children. Their parents don't care, and they come from transient families." After a while, children internalize these attitudes and begin to believe them. For children who are members of a disenfranchised minority group that has historically been victimized by society, this message is almost insidious (Comer 1980). Teachers must reinforce the belief that all students can achieve by conveying high expectations.

One way teachers convey high expectations to students is through teacher-interactional patterns (Cohen 1987). Teachers wait longer for responses from high-achieving students and respond to their questions more often. They also give them more praise and extensive feedback because they expect high achievement.

One way that schools reinforce low expectations is through ability-group techniques. Though many teachers believe that these grouping methods are the most effective means of instruction, Robert Slavin has found that ability grouping is not more effective than heterogeneous placement of students, and that grouping has the most negative effects upon lower-track pupils because it reduces their expectations (Slavin et al. 1989). Alternatives to traditional ability-grouping practices are beginning to be developed that should change the way students see

63

themselves and the manner in which teachers deal with academic and cultural diversity. They will enhance school climate by: (1) conveying the belief that all students can reach their enormous potentials, and (2) developing instructional practices and curriculum that reinforce that vision.

Parent/Community Involvement

Parents are children's first teachers and most important role models (Herenton 1987). Unfortunately, they often do not know how the educational process operates or how they can participate in it in a way that will help their children. Schools can solicit effective community and parent participation in two major ways: by recruiting parents to become involved in everyday school activities and by eliciting a broad-based community effort in the educational enterprise.

James Comer and his colleagues designed the School Development Program in New Haven, Connecticut, specifically to promote active parent-involvement in schools. The Comer schools instituted three levels of parent participation. The first level was broad-based participation in which parents were invited to whole-school activities, such as potluck suppers, gospel music nights, and general meetings. These events served as bridges between home and school. The second level involved participation in day-to day school affairs and brought parents into the classrooms to work as assistants and tutors. Some parents became volunteers and others received minimum wage for about 15 hours of employment. The third level supported parent participation in school governance. It aimed "to develop patterns of shared responsibility and decision making among parents and staff" (Comer 1980, p. 68). The schools encouraged parents to act as partners in schooling rather than as separate advisors. Teachers, principals, and members of the Comer team trained these parents in intervention, developmental, and instructional strategies.

This model has been extremely successful. Students at Martin Luther King, Jr., and Katharine Brennan Elementary Schools in New Haven from 1969 through 1984 produced continual gains in math and reading scores (Comer 1988, p. 47). When the project first began, these schools ranked lowest in achievement among the district's 33 schools. By 1984, the fourth-grade students were found to be third and fourth in the district on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. In addition, the attendance rates became some of the best in the city, and behavior problems declined drastically. Comer believed that the success of the program was due to their *ethos*, or structured approach of collaborative decision-making, rather than defining school climate in terms of rules, discipline, or teacher expectations (Comer, Haynes, and Hamilton-Lee 1987–88, p. 196). Parents were key to their effective school model.

Another successful avenue for encouraging parental involvement is the community-based approach. The Rochester Education Initiative, designed by the Urban League, fostered a grassroots program to inform the community of the low achievement of Black students and the need for a holistic and community-organized program to address the serious educational needs of young people (Johnson, Dwyer, and Spade 1987–88). The League received assistance from businesses, churches, human services, and governmental agencies in developing a comprehensive educational plan.

The project began with public forums that featured speakers from educator, student, and parent groups. These speakers addressed the key question: "What can we do to improve the academic performance of Rochester's students?" Later, community leaders conducted town meetings where educators and community representatives formed school-action committees to develop a range of school improvement projects that included job incentives for student achievement, a marketing program that highlighted the importance of education, and management expertise from the business sector.

The early stages of the plan showed improvement in student-achievement levels for African American ninth, tenth, and eleventh graders. In particular, the number of those students who had B or higher grade averages increased from 226 students in 1986 to 346 in 1987 (Johnson, Dwyer, and Spade 1987–1988, p. 226).

Teacher Involvement in Decision Making

Teachers comprise the largest segment of school faculty, yet often they may not be involved in important school decisions. Successful schools have the participation of the total faculty in planning and executing school reform. In the Comer project, teacher representatives were elected to the school's governance and management team (Comer 1988). This team examined school curriculum and structure and its relationship to student behavior and academic performance. Though the principal was an authority figure, he/she considered the input of this team before making decisions. Major decisions were made by consensus because Comer and his colleagues felt shared decision making resulted in a broader feeling of ownership.

Effective Leadership of the Principal

Principals are key leaders in developing bridges of communication among staff, students, and community. Effective principals understand and view instruction from a system-wide perspective. They can clearly articulate the goals of their schools and can integrate policy into practice by using shared decision making with teachers and parents.

Understanding learning from an ecological perspective, effective principals create mechanisms for dialogue and rapport in which parents and teachers develop a sense of ownership that supports the learning process (Comer 1980, pp. 233–235). Additionally, these principals provide administrative support for community decisions about schooling. They often have financial

and human resources that can assist in funding structural and innovative changes (Wilson and Firestone 1987).

Focus on Developmental and Social Skills

Successful schools create instructional programs that focus on both cognitive and social-skill development.

Educators in these schools do not perceive their students as empty vessels, but as active learners (Devaney and Sykes 1988). They know that rote facts and worksheets will not prepare students to tackle social problems; they know that they must find better ways to develop the critical-thinking skills needed to do so—and they do. These teachers can move from their reliance on textbooks and prepackaged materials to active investigation of social problems connected to students' lives (Goodlad 1984). They know that meaningful relationships between curriculum and life need to be built; otherwise, schools will be removed from reality.

A curriculum that is relevant to the daily lives of students also helps build positive school climate (Firestone and Rosenblum 1988). High school students, in particular, often seek connections between the curriculum and the many personal judgments and decisions that they make. For example, students want to know how learning U.S. history is going to have any bearing upon their ability to earn money or make important decisions. They are more motivated to learn when school content considers their life situations.

In one instance, a group of students requested that their high school examine the underlying issues of racism found at school. They successfully organized a series of school-wide discussions on racism and instituted a pilot course on human behavior that included a large unit on racism. As a result of these activities, the students were able to present school administrators with a list of recommendations for structural changes in the curriculum and in district policies that would address racial problems in their school (Polakow-Suransky and Neda Ulaby

1990). Their actions are an example of how students can force schools to make their education more relevant to the social conflicts that exist in their lives.

In a positive climate for learning, children also have social skills that reinforce the education process. For example, teachers may have helped them develop skills that support cooperative-learning activities, risk taking, and positive interpersonal interactions.

Regular Monitoring of Student Progress and Reinforcement of Success

Successful schools institute monitoring programs that measure student achievement and performance. These schools are constantly assessing their own effectiveness as well, because the data they gather on student performance helps them identify their own areas of weakness. Some schools have instituted criterion-referenced tests for evaluating student progress, which helps teachers to continually check students' knowledge levels in basic skill areas, reinforce successes, and adjust instruction accordingly (Firestone 1989). By making students accountable for their learning, teachers create an environment that reflects high expectations.

CONCLUSION

We have too many at-risk schools, institutions that are struggling to serve our diverse student population. Instead, we need more risking schools, institutions that challenge themselves to create new structures; ones that allow for the infusion of content and strategies that are effective with a diverse student population.

Building a school community is central to the academic and social success of all students. Children often attend schools miles from their homes; in such cases, it may be impossible to build a communal sense with the surrounding neighborhood. Yet it is conceivable to create a community of caring adults made up

of teachers, administrators, parents, and other community role models. In creating that community, school personnel must make the curriculum relevant to students' daily lives.

Cultural and class background may be pivotal elements in the community from which students come. Unfortunately, literature on effective schools offers scattered findings or little research that focuses on the impact of cultural context on the school environment. Cultural factors may not be easily quantified into existing models of school reform. While separate school programs may not be needed for inner-city and suburban schools, there is no one model for school success. Though massive data bases have been gathered on multicultural education, the intangible effect of culture on the psycho-social development of students often is overlooked. Securing parent involvement, using education materials relevant to the community life of students, and understanding that students' motivational system may have cultural roots can help build strong self-concepts.

When educators do not understand how school values and behaviors may conflict with community life-styles, students face the dilemma of choosing between their cultural identity and fitting in at school; these students can suffer from depression, frustration, and confusion. Schools need to understand that the social-cultural context of learning has a major impact upon the interactions and structure of present-day schooling. When schools deny the role of culture and social-political status in the hidden and stated curriculum, the learning environment cannot provide students with an equal educational opportunity.

The process of multicultural schooling is complicated. Educational equity can only occur when we make courageous systemic school changes. We face tremendous problems in schools today; among these are resegregated patterns of student population, escalating dropouts rates, and the continued growth of the underclass. To deal with these problems effectively, we must continue to strengthen the relationship between ethnic communities and schools through dialogue, collective goal

setting, and action planning. For ultimately, all children can be successful in schools.

REFERENCES

Cohen, M. 1987. Improving school effectiveness: Lessons from research. In *Educator's handbook*, edited by V. Richardson-Koehler, 474–490. New York: Longman Publishers.

Coleman, J. 1966. *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

Comer, J. 1988. Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American* 259 (5): 42–28.

Comer, J. 1980. *School power.* New York: The Free Press.

Comer, J.; Haynes, N.; and Hamilton-Lee, M. 1987–1988. School power: A model for improving black student achievement. *Urban Review* 11(1–2):187–200

Devaney, K. and Sykes, G. 1988. Making the case for professionalism. In *Building a professional culture in schools*, edited by A. Lieberman, 3–22. New York: Teachers College Press.

Edmonds, R. 1979. Some schools work and more can. *Social Policy* 9: 28–32

Educational Record. 1987-88. The Boston compact fosters city-wide collaboration. Fall 1987–Winter 1988: 51.

Firestone, W.A. 1989. Beyond order and expectations in high schools serving at-risk youth. *Educational Leadership* 46 (5): 45.

Firestone, W.A. and Rosenblum, S. 1988. Building commitment in urban high schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 10 (4): 285–99.

Fordham, S. 1988. Racelessness as a factor in black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory? *Harvard Educational Review* 58 (1): 54–84.

Goodlad, J.I. 1984 *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Herenton, W. 1987–1988. Memphis inner-city school improvement project: A holistic approach for developing academic excellence. *Urban Review* 11 (1–2): 211–26

Johnson, W.A.; Dwyer, B.; and Spade, J.Z. 1987–1988. A community initiative: Making a difference in the quality of black education. *Urban Review* 11 (1–2): 217–26.

7 0

Murphy, J. 1989. Educational reform in the 1980s: Explaining some surprising success. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 11 (3): 209–21.

Polakow-Suransky, S. and Ulaby, N. 1990. Students take action to combat racism. *Phi Delta Kappan* 71 (8): 601–06.

Slavin, R.E.; Braddock, J.H.; Hall, C.; and Petza, R. J. Alternatives to ability grouping. John Hopkins University, June 1989. Research funded by a grant from the National Education Association.

Wilson, B.L. and Firestone, W.A. 1987. The principal and instruction: Combining bureaucratic and cultural linkages. *Educational Leadership* 45 (1): 18–23.

Wilson, C.D. and Fergus, E.O. 1988. Combining effective schools and school improvement research traditions for achieving equity-based education. *Equity and Excellence* 24 (1): 54–65.

Chapter 5

LEARNING STYLES: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS

by Karen Swisher

Ten years ago in a publication by the National Education Association, Barbara Cox and Manuel Ramirez (1981) asked the following questions:

> Do minority students have a "style of learning" that is different from mainstream students? Are minority students really any different from other students in the way they learn? If such differences do exist, how have they developed? What can or should educators do to be responsive to these differences? (p. 61).

Their questions and similar questions posed by other educational researchers and practitioners continue to be compelling ones as we prepare to enter the twenty-first century. The search for more effective ways to serve an increasing number of students who have not been well-served by our nation's schools has never been more important than it is now. The "browning of America" is giving our schools a different complexion; the number of children who live below the poverty line and/or are homeless is increasing; and the high number of "at-risk" or "school-weary" students has caused alarm. All of these factors are reported among the many concerns in the call for reforming or restructuring American schools.

The purpose of this chapter is to focus on the construct of learning styles as a promising, yet not "panaceaistic," view of successful schooling for our multicultural population of students. Knowledge about learning styles has recently been more accessible to practitioners. "In the last decade, some teachers have begun to experiment with *learning styles*, persuaded that the

72

concept helps them to both understand differences better and to provide for those differences, thereby improving learning" (Brandt 1990, p. 3). It goes without saying that some expert teachers have intuitively been doing this for years. They have always accommodated students' individual differences by varying their style of instruction or by giving students options for demonstrating competence. This chapter is intended to validate the convictions and spirit of those expert teachers and to provide information for those who want to know more, recognizing that "we continue to do our best, knowing that we don't know everything, but keeping our minds open to the emerging knowledge that can help us be more effective" (Brandt 1990, p. 3).

LEARNING STYLES DEFINED

The definition of *learning style* has been discussed and debated for several years. In 1983, the National Task Force on Learning Style and Brain Behavior offered the following definition:

> *Learning style* is that consistent pattern of behavior and performance by which an individual approaches educational experiences. It is the composite of characteristic cognitive, affective, and physiological behaviors that serve as relatively stable indicators of how a learner perceives, interacts with, and responds to the learning environment. It is formed in the deep structure of neural organization and personality [that] molds and is molded by human development and the cultural experiences of home, school, and society (Keefe and Langios, p. 1).

This definition, with emphasis on "cultural experiences of home, school, and society," is the basis for the following discussion of learning styles and its implications for teaching and learning in a multicultural society.

RESEARCH BASE

Research into the nature of learning styles began decades ago. Using tests of perception, Herman Witkin and his associates

73

in 1954 began to study the field-dependent and field-independent dimension of cognitive style. Their work was concerned with how people use the visual environment around them; in other words, the extent to which the surrounding organized field influences the person's perception of an item within it. For example, in an embedded-figures test, participants were asked to locate a simple figure in a more complex pattern. Individual differences in performance indicated some people were able to quickly locate the simple figure; they saw the items as separate from the surrounding field and were designated field independent. Those who could not locate the figure in the time allotted were designated field dependent because their perception was dominated by the surrounding field.

Field-independent learners have a perception of discrete parts and are good at abstract analytical thought. They tend to be individualistic, less sensitive to the emotions of others, and have poorly developed social skills. They favor inquiry and independent study and can provide their own structure to facilitate learning. Field-independent learners are intrinsically motivated and less responsive to social reinforcement.

Conversely, field-dependent learners have a global perspective and are less adept at analytical problem solving. They tend to be highly sensitive and attuned to the social environment; their social skills are highly developed. They favor a spectator approach to learning and organize information to be learned in the form it is given. They are extrinsically motivated and responsive to social reinforcement (Witkin et al. 1967).

Several researchers have applied other names to describe the ends of the cognitive style continuum. For example, Rosalie Cohen (1969) described the dimensions as analytical and relational. Ramirez and Alfredo Castañeda(1974) believed that the term "dependent" implied negative connotations and substituted the term "sensitive" in its place, thus "field sensitive" and "field independent" are terms identified with their work.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURE AND LEARNING STYLES

The relationship between culture and cognitive style, as conceptualized by Witkin and others, has been studied over the last two decades. For example, Ramirez and Castañeda (1974) built upon the research of Witkin (1967), which indicated that socialization practices play a large role in determining learning behavior preferences in children. A framework set forth by Ramirez and Castañeda in 1974 suggests that cultural values influence socialization practices (1981), which affect the ways children prefer to learn. Cox and Ramirez (1981) explained the framework in this way:

> Clearly, the task, the situation, and the materials influence the ways that children are encouraged to learn or behave, and few families encourage only field-independent or field-sensitive learning, even though on the average they may use one type of strategy more than the other. The predominant or general teaching style of a family may thus be of basic importance in deciding the direction a child's learning preferences may take. Insofar as these teaching styles reflect a certain set of values held by parents and family, values that in many cases are clearly culturally determined, one may posit that cultural differences in learning-style preferences develop through children's early experiences. (p. 63)

Differences in socialization practices in Mexican American, African American, Asian American, and American Indian and Alaskan Native cultures suggest that a model such as the one presented by Ramirez and Castañeda has credence. For example, if sharing, generosity, and cooperation are respected cultural values, children will be socialized accordingly, and their approach to learning may reflect a preference for shared-group learning or decision making rather than for independent learning.

While there is evidence of the relationship between culture and learning styles, there is also great concern that characterizing learners from particular cultural backgrounds as

having a specific learning style may result in discriminatory practice or excuses for failure. However, schools in general have expected learning styles to be more analytical or field independent, and some learners whose styles may be more relational or field dependent/sensitive have not done well in our schools. Other students have changed and adapted very well, lending support to the notion that styles are learned. But learners should not have to bear sole responsibility for adapting or changing; schools can and should share it.

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND LEARNING STYLES

The ideology of a culturally pluralistic society in which the diversity of populations is given equal recognition and value was recognized and expressed in the philosophy of "the original proud possessors of this continent" who were cognizant of the diversity "not only of the winged peoples of the air, but also, the two-leggeds—humankind." (Whiteman et al. 1974, p. 197). In the early twentieth century, philosopher Horace Kallen (1924) reaffirmed this right in the concept we know as cultural pluralism. In our nation's schools, multicultural education is the embodiment of this concept.

Multicultural education recognizes that there are multiple ways of perceiving, evaluating, believing, and behaving. We recognize that people perceive and learn about the world in different ways, and that they demonstrate this understanding in unique ways. How they have learned to learn about their world is characteristic of the socialization practices within the cultures from which they come. While we can articulate the importance of this concept, we are still not very good at determining what this means in terms of providing education that is multicultural. Thus, we believe it has to do with providing each child an equal opportunity to develop to full potential; we understand that attending to individual differences may mean treating children unequally; and we prefer to talk about treating children equitably

and fairly rather than equally or the same. The learning-styles construct is a vehicle for doing what Christine Bennett (1990) has suggested, that is, moving us beyond the rhetoric associated with individual differences and educational equity.

LEARNING STYLE DIFFERENCES

An awareness of the characteristics of groups of people is important. We must also realize that this knowledge helps us to understand groups, not individual learners. Diversity within each cultural or ethnic group exists and is demonstrated in aspects such as language use, child-rearing practices, and socialization methods. Diversity is also determined by the degree to which members of a particular group have assimilated aspects of the larger society or macroculture and the social class to which the family "belongs." Because of this intragroup diversity, it is unrealistic to think that all members of a certain group will have a particular learning style. However, there are general characteristics that provide a basis for further investigation into the individual characteristics that constitute style. Presenting information about the learning styles of African Americans, American Indians and Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, and Hispanics may contribute to greater understanding, but it may also reinforce stereotypical notions about the relationship between learning styles and cultural group membership. It is with this caution that the following information is presented.

African Americans

Researchers such as Janice Hale-Benson (1986), Asa Hilliard (1976), and Barbara Shade (1982) have focused on the learning styles of African American youth. They have noted differences between African American students and their multicultural counterparts as well as differences among African American students themselves. Hale-Benson and Hilliard, for example, have used the work of Cohen (1969) in describing African American youth as more relational than analytical in

77

their approach to learning. *Relational* is similar to Witkin's field-dependent conceptual style and is produced by family socialization patterns in which members share functions, thereby socializing their members to be more relational in their learning styles. Shade suggested that success in school requires sequential, analytical, or object-oriented cognitive styles; the "culture or life-style and world view of Afro-Americans, however, portrays strategies designed to foster survival and therefore tends to be rather universalistic, intuitive, and more than that, very person-oriented" (Shade 1982).

American Indians and Alaskan Natives

What do we know about the learning styles of American Indian and Alaskan Native children who come from more than 500 tribal groups? We have very little empirical data available when one considers that as an indigenous group, American Indians are among the most researched of all cultures in this country.

A review of the literature regarding American Indian learning styles by Karen Swisher and D. Deyhle (1989) presented some anecdotal and empirical information from various researchers about several tribal groups. Similarities exist, perhaps because of the indigenous nature shared by all groups, but there are differences as well. For example, Navajo, Oglala Sioux, and Yaqui cultures teach that competence should precede performance. Observation and self-testing in private are important steps that must be taken before one demonstrates competence of a task. The review also cited the visual strengths of Kwakuitl and Eskimo children of the Northwest and of Navajo and Pueblo children of the Southwest as well as the cooperative nature of Cherokee and Kwakuitl children.

Gaining communicative competence and participation in classroom interactional structures were areas studied by Susan Philips (1983) in her work with Indian children in Warm Springs, Oregon. She found that community norms as well as

socialization practices had greatly influenced the way children gained communicative competence and their preference for participation in small cooperative-learning groups. It has been speculated that American Indians tend to be field dependent; however, recent exploratory work on learning styles of Jicarilla Apache children by Swisher and Bonnie Page (1990) indicated that intragroup differences exist to the point that no general tendencies could be determined.

Asian Americans

Intragroup diversity among Asian Americans is often overlooked in favor of a recent characterization of Asians as the "model minority." Asian students have been typified as hard working, high achieving, polite, and docile. This style of learning appears to be compatible with what is expected in American classrooms; therefore, research into this dimension of their educational experience has been limited. While we know that the same spectrum of diversity is found in the Asian American group as in other minorities, the experiences of recent immigrants from Southeast Asia serve as a vivid reminder of that fact. Differences in child-rearing and socialization practices, language, and communication in the families from which the children come should alert us to diversity in learning styles. We should not make assumptions based on behavioral observations. Additional information on the myths and stereotypes of Asian Americans and recent Southeast Asian newcomers are provided by the works of Valerie Ooka Pang (1990) and of Don Nakanishi and Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi (1983).

Hispanics

Hispanic is a term that encompasses people from Spanish-speaking ancestry, nations, or territories, regardless of race. But they are all people with different histories. Heterogeneity characterizes this large group of Spanish-speaking people, although they do share some religious, social, and cultural values.

79

The landmark work of Ramirez and Castañeda on learning styles of Mexican American children has provided a definitive lens through which the relationship between culture and learning can be viewed. Their framework, described earlier in this chapter, suggested that socialization practices influenced by cultural values strongly affect the ways in which children approach learning tasks. Their research indicated that Mexican American children tend to be field sensitive in their learning styles. For example, they prefer to work with others to achieve a common goal, and they tend to be more sensitive to the feelings and opinions of others (Ramirez and Castañeda1974).

A Final Note

Having said that "minority students may more often display preferences for field-sensitive learning approaches," Cox and Ramirez (1981) caution us to not ignore the great diversity within any culture. They remind us that the learning-styles construct should be a tool for individualization, rather than a label for categorizing and evaluating.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

What does the information contained in this chapter imply? First of all, it suggests that "educational equity will exist for all students when teachers become sensitive to the cultural diversity in their classrooms, vary their teaching styles so as to appeal to a diverse student population, and modify their curricula to include ethnic content (Banks).

Swisher and Deyhle (1989) propose that teachers who are empathetic and want to change, do not do so simply because they have not had the time to reflect, research, and restructure their teaching style. There may never be enough time to do this, but it is an essential element in understanding the learning styles of all children in our classrooms. Several informal and formal guides have been developed for identification of learning styles. Getting to know our students and their home background should be a

requisite beginning-of-the-year activity. Bennett encourages teachers to, first of all, know their own learning and teaching styles and then determine how far they can comfortably stray from these strengths and preferences. She cautions teachers to build classroom flexibility slowly, adding one new strategy at a time. She encourages teachers to consider all modes of instruction (visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic) when teaching new concepts and skills. Multisensory approaches should be an important consideration in all instructional delivery.

In the 1981 NEA publication, *Education in the '80s: Implications for Multiethnic Education*, Cox and Ramirez suggested a process for assessment and planning. The suggestions are still very practical for teachers to consider:

1. Assess students' preferred ways of learning and the way(s) in which student behaviors change from situation to situation.
2. Plan learning experiences that address conceptual goals or skills or other objectives that incorporate the student's preferred ways of learning by using teaching methods, incentives, materials, and situations that are planned according to student preferences.
3. Implement the learning experiences that were planned.
4. Evaluate the learning experiences in terms of attainment of conceptual or other goals as well as in terms of observed student behaviors and involvement.
5. As the year progresses, plan and implement student participation in learning experiences that require behaviors the student has previously avoided. Incorporate only one aspect at a time of the total experience from the less familiar behaviors—focusing on only the reward, the materials, the situation,

or the task requirements—so that the student uses what is familiar and comfortable or motivating as support for the newer learning experience aspects.

6. Continue to provide familiar, comfortable, successful experiences as well as to gradually introduce the children to learning new ways (pp. 64–65).

Informal student and teacher observable behavior checklists have been developed by Ramirez and Castañeda (1974); they provide valuable tools in the identification of both learning and teaching-style tendencies. Other instruments that assess cognitive style, affective style, perceptual modality, and multidimensional aspects have been developed and are described in a publication by Claudia Cornett (1983).

CONCLUSION

Knowledge about learning styles is a powerful component in a teacher's repertoire of effective instruction. Use or implementation of knowledge about learning styles demonstrates, in an observable manner, the valuing of diversity. The fundamental values of equity, fairness, and equal treatment of all children are manifested in teachers' personal behaviors as they adapt their instruction and interact with learners. Above all, knowledge about the learning-style characteristics of particular groups should be used as a guide, not a stereotype, for understanding individuals in our schools. While not conclusive, there is evidence that achievement is affected by teaching to students' learning-style strengths.

REFERENCES

Banks, J.A. 1988. Ethnicity, class, cognitive, and motivational styles: Research and training implications. *Journal of Negro Education* 57 (4): 466.

Bennett, C. 1990. *Comprehensive multicultural education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brandt, R. 1990. If we only knew enough. *Educational Leadership* 48 (2): 3.

Cohen, R.A. 1969. Conceptual styles, cultural conflict, and nonverbal tests of intelligence. *American Anthropologist* 71: 828–56.

Cornett, C.E. 1983. *What you should know about teaching and learning styles.* Bloomington, Id.: Phi Delta Kappan Foundation.

Cox, B.G. and Ramirez, M. 1981. Cognitive styles: Implications for multiethnic education. In *Education in the '80s: Implications for multiethnic education,* edited by J. A. Banks, 61. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Hale-Benson, J.E. 1986. *Black children: Their roots, culture, and learning styles.* Revised ed. Baltimore, Md.: The John Hopkins University Press.

Hilliard, A. 1976. Alternatives to IQ testing: An approach to the identification of gifted minority children. Final report to the California State Department of Education, 1976.

Kallen, H.M. 1924. *Culture and democracy in the United States.* New York: Boni and Liveright.

Keefe, J.W. and Languis, M. 1983. *Learning Stages Network Newsletter* 4 (2): 1.

Nakanishi, D.T. and Hirano-Nakanishi, M. eds. 1983. *The education of Asian and Pacific American: Historical perspectives and prescriptions for the future.* Phoenix Az.: Oryx Press.

Pang, V.O. 1990. Asian-American children: A diverse population. *The Education Forum* 55: 49–66.

Philips, S.U. 1983. *The invisible culture.* New York: Longman Publishers.

Ramirez, M. and Castañeda, A. 1974. *Cultural democracy, bicognitive development, and education.* New York: Academic Press.

Shade, B.J. 1982. Afro-American cognitive style: A variable in school success? *Review of Educational Research* 52 (2): 219–44.

Swisher, K. and Deyhle, D. 1989. The styles of learning are different, but teaching is just the same: Suggestions for teachers of American Indian youth. *Journal of American Indian Education,* August 1989, 1–14.

Swisher, K. and Page, B. 1990. Determining Jicarilla Apache learning styles: A collaborative approach. Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Mass., 18 April 1990.

83

Whiteman, H.; Covington, R.J.; Holland, F.; Lemon, D.; and Locke, P. 1974. The Native American perspective on teacher competencies: It is not necessary for eagles to be crows. In *Multicultural education through competency-based teacher education*, edited by W.A. Hunter, p. 197. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education

Witkin, H.A. 1967. A cognitive style approach to cross-cultural research. *International Journal of Psychology* 2: 233–50.

Witkin, H.A.; Moore, C.A.; Goodenough, D.R.; and Cox, P.W. 1977. *Cognitive style and the teaching/learning process.* Cassette series 3F. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Chapter 6

RETHINKING THE ROLE OF GENDER AND ACHIEVEMENT IN SCHOOLING

by Jane Bernard-Powers

Michelle, a 12-year-old girl whom I know very well, recently reminded me of a powerful stereotype that emerges in early adolescence and shadows young women through their high school years. She said that "brainy" girls are not popular. Just as Carl Grant and Christine Sleeter (1986) found at Five Bridges Junior High School in their study entitled "After the School Bell Rings," cultural imperatives about gender roles are still part of the fabric of school life. The tenaciously low enrollment figures for young women in advanced mathematics and physics courses, the dominance of young men participating in industrial arts courses and high-school athletics, and persisting evidence of textbook bias all serve to remind educators of the significance of gender in schools (Fanner and Sidney 1985).

This chapter explores the influence of gender, that is, the significance of being male or female on educational experiences and achievement. It begins with an introduction to current theoretical issues on sex differences and then discusses gender biases in testing, content areas, and classroom management.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The connections between life opportunities, achievement in schools, and gender dynamics seem self-evident. However, the last 20 years of scholarship, informed reflection, and research have taught us that specific causal relationships are elusive and that gender dynamics in schools are complex. Early attempts to solve "the problem" of sexism in schools focused on

85

equity and documentation of differences. *Equity* was a key concept that came to mean fairness in the distribution of funding and human resources, access to courses and curriculum materials that reflected the range of human experiences, and the elimination of gender stereotypes that demeaned females and limited males. Two decades after the equity report "Dick and Jane as Victims" was published, it is clear that identifying and documenting the problems of sexism were only the first critical steps, and that the simple refurbishing of an earlier cupboard cannot accommodate the complexity of gender issues.

Three key concepts surface when studying gender issues. These are *difference*, *salience*, and *negotiation*. *Difference* refers to the act of viewing gender issues as a unitary theory of male and female contrasts. Thinking about masculine and feminine as binary opposites on a single spectrum of human experience and achievement can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy. The goal of inquiry and understanding becomes one of documenting and explaining differences, and these distinctions become the standard for viewing the issue. But the complexity of human learning in school settings is much more complex than that. It is a function of gender as well as ethnicity, social class, language, and sexual orientation in a particular setting and time. Thus, bipolar notions of gender have been replaced by patchwork quilts of patterns and colors that represent multiple variables and perspectives.

The second key concept, *salience*, is found in the work of Barrie Thorne (1990), an ethnographer who studies gender as a participant-observer in classrooms, lunchrooms, and playgrounds. Thorne noted that gender separation in a physical sense did not happen all the time, but seemed to be situational. She found that, "The occasions when girls and boys are together are as theoretically and socially significant as when they are apart." Thus, to understand gender relations, ". . . one must grapple with the multiple standpoints, complex and even contradictory meanings, and the varying salience of gender" (pp. 103,111).

86

The last concept is *negotiation.* Students and teachers are participants in a system whereby gender constraints and gender relations are negotiated, sometimes consciously and often unconsciously. The confusing and conflicting array of norms and rules that young females and males encounter in the classroom, lunchroom, playground, and halls necessitates negotiation through *accommodation* and *resistance.* As Jean Anyon (1983) found in her study of fifth graders, girls can resist the middle-class feminine-gender prescriptions by dressing and behaving in ways that teachers find provocative (p. 33). Similarly, boys resist the perceived feminine culture of classrooms by setting up disruptions. Students are active participants in school culture, and they respond collectively and individually to cultural messages. Given the choice of accommodating or resisting a middle-class attitude and behavior toward school and work, many will choose the latter. It seems to help them maintain their independence.

The idea that social structures and values are mainly responsible for the underachievement of groups of students is limiting because it masks the subtleties and complexities of processes that work in schooling. Students are not passive victims in these processes; nor are teachers hapless victims of cultural reproduction systems. Students, teachers, and administrators may contribute to the factors that limit opportunities as well as to those that expand them. Our challenge is to identify crucial structures and processes that will increase life opportunities for all students and maximize the potential of our diversity. Gender is one of four keys.

GENDER BIASES IN SCHOOL

The following paragraphs examine gender biases in important areas of schooling: in testing, content areas, and classroom management.

PSAT and SAT Testing Biases

Every spring approximately one million high school

juniors gather in cafeterias and auditoriums to take the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Qualifying Test (PSAT). Scores from the PSAT, combined with high-school grades, greatly influence the opportunities for college scholarship, and hence, for college education itself.

According to Phyllis Rosser (1989), author of *The SAT Gender Gap: Identifying the Causes*, women are penalized by test biases, resulting in lower overall scores. Rosser also claims, "reliance on biased tests has a severe economic impact on women, who lose millions of dollars in merit scholarship awards . . ." (p.4). In 1987–88 for example, women were eligible for only 36 percent of the 6,000 college scholarships, based on their qualifying score that was 67 points lower than men's. Moreover, opportunities for academic enrichment programs in high schools are also lost as a result of low PSAT scores (Rosser 1989).

The problems with the PSAT and its administration are considerable. First, it inaccurately underestimates academic performance. Grades reported for females in kindergarten through grade 12 are consistently higher than those of their male counterparts; the same holds true during the first year of college. Thus, if women are scoring lower than men on the PSAT but outperforming them academically, the test is persistently, incorrectly predicting women's grades during the first year of college.

In past years of reporting PSAT and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) results, women's verbal scores were higher than men's, and their math scores were lower; in math, the difference during the last 21 years was 41–52 points (Rosser 1989). On SAT scores for 1988, women scored lower in both mean verbal and mathematics sections. These statistics, however, do not reflect grades for the performance of young women and men on other standardized high school tests. (Rosser 1989)

Item analysis of the SAT test revealed persistent effects of bias in the content of the questions. "A larger percentage of women than men chose the correct answers for questions

referring to relationships and a larger percentage of men chose the correct answers for questions referring to physical science, sports, and the stock market" (Rosser 1989, p. 7).

The most serious problem with the SAT scores is how some young women interpret them. According to Rosser (1989), young men and women believed that the test was a fair measure of their abilities. That means that young women see themselves as less able than their male contemporaries. For some young women, especially minority women for whom scholarship monies and belief in self are critical, the consequences of this assumption could include opting out of college.

Social Studies

The first consideration in the area of social studies content-bias relates to the previous discussion of standardized tests. The National Assessment of Educational Progress has found that "males consistently outperform females on measures of political knowledge" (Hahn, Bernard-Powers et al. 1985, p.281). State-wide testing of high school juniors in Maine in 1986 resulted in substantially higher scores in social studies for males than females—304–197 (Rosser 1989). In 1985 and 1986, 300,000 eighth-grade students in California were tested under the California Assessment Program (CAP). On the new history/social science test, boys did better on 467 of the questions, while girls scored higher on 253. Whereas, "Boys did better on questions related to war, historical documents (such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights), and questions involving geography or chronology . . . . Girls did better on questions related to interpretation of slogans, quotations (except those associated with war), women's rights, or questions in which the focus of the question was a woman (Kneedler 1988). Disparities in scores and performance on specific items suggest that test bias is a problem; moreover, the curriculum knowledge that is being tested is also problematic.

An important point in this issue, both in terms of the SAT and the CAP test, is the collection of data. Lobbies for gender-fair testing have gathered numerous data based on gender and race and/or ethnicity. Now, funding for analysis of this data is a critical need, one that is threatened by budget cutbacks. For example, in California the analysis of performance on the basis of gender has been abandoned due to lack of funding. Data collected and analyzed on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, and linguistic abilities are key to understanding the dynamics of gender in social studies.

Another vital issue in social studies is *curriculum materials.* Research on social studies instruction in the late seventies found that textbooks dominate social studies instruction (Hahn, Bernard-Powers et al. 1985). This is a particularly important fact because the "most extensively documented inequity in social studies is the underrepresentation and stereotyping of females in social studies textbooks" (p. 281). Despite the virtual revolution in scholarship in ethnic, family, social, and women's histories, textbooks continue to provide inaccurate views of the past and limited role models for young men and young women of all races and ethnic groups. In her 1990 keynote address to the National Council for the Social Studies, Darline Clark-Hine presented evidence that four currently used textbooks consistently failed to provide a significant political and social context for the lives of black women, and that people of color were marginalized. She concluded that the dominant narrative requires a total reconceptualization.

A third gender issue in social studies is *political socialization.* Two studies completed in the mid-seventies reported that young people did not support the idea of women as political leaders (Hahn, Bernard-Powers et al. 1985). A more current study (Gillespie and Spohn, 1987) reported that a substantial percentage of young white and young black men, grades 7–12, did not believe that women were as qualified as men to run the country. A high percentage of the young white women

and young black women, 86 percent and 81 percent respectively, thought that women were just as qualified, whereas only 50 percent of white men and 53 percent of black men agreed with the statement. Thus, it is an important dimension of social studies in which males are being undereducated.

Reading

Reading is one of two areas that have been written about extensively in relation to gender. Gender differences favoring girls and young women have been reported in National Assessment of Educational Progress results for almost 20 years, and the differences were sustained in the SATs. However, trends in both the NAEP and the SAT tests indicate that the gender gap is closing. In fact, nationally, men outscored women on the 1987 SAT by approximately 10 points (Rosser 1989).

Potentially more critical than the closing gender gap in reading and verbal skills is the low performance of minority youths on standardized reading tests, something that may or may not be salient to gender. Forty-five percent of white 17-year-olds are "adept" in reading according to the NAEP 1984 test results, which means they can find, summarize, and analyze complicated information (NAEP 1985). In contrast, only 16 to 20 percent of Black and Hispanic 17-year-olds are adept readers. Drop-out rates for Black and Hispanic males are reported to be generally higher than for females of all races and ethnic groups, and this may be related to reading and the extent to which the needs of this population are not being met. Data collection and analysis that combines gender, ethnicity, and linguistic abilities can illuminate these potentially salient issues.

Math, Science, and Computer Education

Although science educators are currently concerned about national levels of achievement, the participation and achievement of women of color, of women in general, and of minorities in general have been particular concerns since the

early seventies. Nevertheless, women and minority students are underrepresented in higher education mathematics and science departments and in technical fields. According to NAEP findings, "More than half of the nation's 17-year-olds appear to be inadequately prepared either to perform competently jobs that require technical skills or to benefit from specialized on-the-job training . . . . At age 17 . . . only one-third of the females demonstrated the ability to analyze scientific material and data," and for Blacks and Hispanics, the proportion was even lower (NAEP 1985, pp. 30–31). Research on motivation has found that the male/female differences in achievement cannot be explained entirely by attitudes toward the subject, however. There are other circumstances and variables affecting performance (Steinkamp and Maehr 1984).

One of the most significant recent findings indicates that gender differences among high school students are declining, and that when science processes are separated from knowledge, differences only occur in measures of knowledge. This attests to the fluidity of gendered learning and refutes notions of immutable sex differences. Research on mathematics achievement has found that girls' and boys' achievement is relatively equal up until ages 12–13, when males seem to develop an advantage (Hyde, Fennema, and Lamon 1990). This advantage increases up through high school and into college years, when females and minorities self-select out of fields that have advanced mathematics prerequisites. SAT scores for mathematical ability have favored males for about 20 years; however, researchers have found these differences to be disappearing (Linn and Hyde 1989).

Computer education is recognized as a significant area of competency for students in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The potential of computer education for reorganizing educational settings makes computer competency especially important. Thus, findings on computer use are particularly compelling. Peg Griffin and Michael Cole (1987) wrote that computer use is making ". . . the position of

minorities and women, relatively worse with respect to Anglo/male norms used in such comparisons." They reported that:

1. More computers are being placed in the hands of middle- and upper-class children.
2. When computers are placed in the hands of poor children, they are used for rote drill and practice instead of for the "cognitive enrichment" that they provide middle- and upper-class students.
3. Female students have less involvement than male students with computers in schools, irrespective of race or ethnicity.

These findings in performance differences for males and females in math, science, and computers suggest the need for change in several areas. Teacher training needs to include information about contexts that foster equal participation for males, females, and minorities in all three of these areas. Continued support for elementary science teachers who find time and resources at a premium is critical. Interdisciplinary teaching that incorporates teaching reading with science and social studies will increase the number of minutes that young women and minorities are provided in instruction. After-school programs and special programs, such as the *Equals* project at the Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley, California, can provide out-of-school time for working in hands-on science, mathematics, and computing, thereby developing confidence in abilities and increasing interest in careers (Skolnick, Langbon, and Day 1982). Increased requirements at the secondary level; increased support for young women and minorities in one-to-one and small-group work and peer tutoring; and counseling that is sensitive to race, class, and ethnic issues may help students to accurately estimate their abilities and value their own knowledge and understanding.

Classroom Organization and Instruction

The final topic for consideration in the discussion of gender and achievement is *classroom organization* and *instruction.* Group work based on theory guiding practice holds great promise for maximizing learning and harnessing the effects of gender, ethnicity, and race on classroom achievement. By providing training for group roles, very specific feedback on demonstrated student strengths, and modeling for equal treatment of humans, we can increase learning in math and science, group problem-solving, and prosocial behavior for minorities and young women. The program for Complex Instruction at Stanford University in California, is an example of a program that trains educators to use instruction that is designed to be gender friendly as well as racially, ethnically, and linguistically friendly (Cohen 1988).

Considering the importance of context holds the promise of improving instruction for everyone. *Context,* in this case, means the context for learning. Providing meaningful and challenging problems (or contexts) that house various cognitive learning tasks is more effective than direct instruction or seatwork. Researchers have found that the principles that influence learning in early childhood are very useful for older children and adults. Rather than isolating instruction into discrete bounded tasks, instruction and learning for the next century needs to be placed in a context that includes problems similar to those that students will encounter in their life journey. We need to increase the cognitive complexity and build on the strengths and challenges that our diverse populations have brought us.

CONCLUSION

Our work in sex equity in the sixties and seventies raised questions and built a scaffolding from which we continue to profit. The problem of equal access to opportunities and

education for young women of all races and ethnic groups has not been totally redressed, but we now know that it will not go away or slide into oblivion.

In the eighties and nineties, research and scholarship in the content areas as well as in pedagogy, classroom management, achievement motivation, and testing has led us to an appreciable understanding of the complexity of gendered systems. Gender is an omnipresent reality that rarely stands alone. An appreciation of salience, context, negotiation, and a healthy skepticism of any easy prescription for progress will carry us into the next century. In education, it is our diverse and gendered student population who provide the motivation and the modeling for us to move into the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES

Anyon, J. 1983. Intersections of gender and class: Accommodation and resistance by working-class and affluent females to contradictory sex-role ideologies. In *Gender, class, and education*, edited by S.Walker and L. Barton, 33. Sussex: Falmer Press.

Clark-Hine, D. 1990. The treatment of minorities in U.S. history textbooks. Oral address to the National Council for the Social Studies, November 1990. Anaheim, Ca.

Cohen, E. 1988. *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogenous classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cole, M. and Griffin, P. eds. 1987. *Contextual factors in education.* Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Farmer, H. and Seliger-Sidney, J. 1985. Sex equity in career and vocational education. In *Handbook for achieving sex equity in education*, edited by S. Klein. Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University Press.

Gillespie, D. and Spohn, C. 1987. Adolescents' attitudes toward women in politics: The effect of gender and race. *Gender and Society* 1 (2): 208-18.

Grant, C. and Sleeter, C. 1986. *After the school bell rings.* Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Hahn, C.; Bernard-Powers, J.; . 1985. Sex equity in the social studies. In *Handbook for achieving sex equity in education*, edited by S. Klein, 281. Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University Press.

Kneedler, P. 1988. Differences between boys and girls on California's new statewide assessments in history-social science. Paper presented at the California Council for the Social Studies, March 1988.

Linn, M.C. and Shibley-Hyde, J. 1989. Gender, mathematics, and science. *Educational Researcher* 18 (8): 22.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. 1985. *The reading report card.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. 1988. *The science report card.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Rosser, P. 1989. *The SAT gender gap: Identifying the causes.* Washington, DC: Center for Women Policy Studies.

Shibley-Hyde, J.; Fennema, E.; and Lamon, S.L. 1990. Gender differences in mathematics performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 107 (2): 139. Skolnick, J.; Langbort, C.; and Day, L. 1982. *How to encourage girls in math and science.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Steinkamp, M.W. and Maehr, M.L. 1984. Gender differences in motivational orientations toward achievement in school science: A quantitative synthesis. *American Education Research Journal* 21 (1): 43.

Thorne, B. 1990. Children and gender. In *Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference,* edited by D. Rhode, 103 & 111. New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press.